

The
American Historical Review

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: AN INTERPRETATION

YOU will not, I trust, take it amiss if, on this the occasion of our annual meeting, I select as my topic the familiar subject of the American Revolution. Quite apart from the pleasure that comes from harping on an old string, there is the conviction, which I hold very strongly, that no matter how familiar a subject may be, it can always be re-examined with profit and viewed not infrequently from such points of vantage as to set the scene in quite a new light. The writing of history is always a progressive process, not merely or mainly because each age must write its own history from its own point of view, but rather because each generation of scholars is certain to contribute to historical knowledge and so to approach nearer than its predecessor to an understanding of the past. No one can accept as complete or final any rendering of history, no matter how plausible it may be, nor consider any period or phase of the past as closed against further investigation. Our knowledge of history is and always will be in the making, and it has been well said that orthodox history and an orthodox historian involve a contradiction in terms.

The explanations of history have been characterized as a rule by overmuch simplicity. So wrote Maitland of the history of England and so with equal justice might he have written of the history of America. As with natural phenomena in the pre-Copernican days of celestial mechanics, when the world believed that the sun moved and the earth was flat, so it has been at all times with historical phenomena, that what to the superficial observer has appeared to be true has been accepted far too often as containing the whole truth. Among these pre-Copernican convictions, for example, widely held in America to-day, is the belief that the American Revolution was brought about by British tyranny. Whatever explanation of that great event comes to be accepted by competent historians and their intelligent readers as a near approach to the truth, it is quite certain that it will not be anything as easy and simple as all that. There

was nothing simple about the Balance of Power or the Balance of Trade, even when construed in terms of such vulgar commodities as fish, furs, and molasses, and particularly when one must give due consideration to the doctrine, as seriously held in some quarters to-day as it was in the eighteenth century, that colonial possessions are the natural sources for home industries. Our history before 1783 was a much more complex and cosmopolitan affair than older writers would have us believe, for they have failed to account for many deep-lying and almost invisible factors and forces which influence and often determine human action and are always elusive and difficult to comprehend.

Recent writers have approached the subject with a full recognition of the complexity of the problems involved. They have found many and varied conflicting activities making for disagreement and misunderstanding between the mother country and her offspring, giving rise to impulses and convictions, ideas and practices, that were difficult, if not impossible, of reconciliation. Such scholars have expressed their conclusions in many different forms. Some have seen a struggle between two opposing historical tendencies—one imperialistic and expansive, the other domestic and intensive; others, a clash of ideas regarding the constitution of the British empire and the place that a colony should occupy in its relations with the mother country. Some have stressed the differences that were bound to arise between an old and settled country and one that was not only dominated by the ideas and habits of the frontier, but was opposed also to the continued supremacy of a governing authority three thousand miles away. Others have explained the situation in terms of an antagonism between the law and institutions of England and those, growing constantly more divergent, of the Puritan and non-Puritan colonies in America. All of these explanations are sound, because they are based on an understanding of the deeper issues involved; and taken together, they are illuminating in that they enable the reader to broaden his point of view, and to break away from the endless controversies over immediate causes and war guilt that have hitherto tended to dominate the American mind.

But elucidating as these explanations are, no one of them seems quite sufficient to resolve so complex a subject as the causes of the American Revolution. To-day we conjure with such words as evolution and psychology, and look for explanations of acts on the part of both individuals and groups in states of mind produced by inheritance and environment. Fielding, acknowledged expert in the study of human experience, can say that for a man "to act in direct

contradiction to the dictates of his nature is, if not impossible, as improbable as anything which can well be conceived". The philosophers tell us that mind can be more resistant even than matter, and that it is easier to remove mountains than it is to change the ideas of a people. That the impact of convictions is one of the most frequent causes of revolution we must acknowledge; and I believe that we have not considered sufficiently the importance of this fact in determining the relations of England with colonial America. If I may, by way of illustrating my point, I should like to show that certain differences existing between England and her colonies in mental attitudes and convictions proved in the end more difficult to overcome than the diverging historical tendencies or the bridging the three thousand miles of the Atlantic itself.

The American Revolution marks the close of one great period of our history and the beginning of another of even greater significance. It is the red line across our years, because by it was brought about a fundamental change in the status of the communities on the American seaboard—a change from dependence to independence. We sometimes hear that revolutions are not made but happen. In their immediate causes this is not true—for revolutions do not happen, they are made, in that they are the creatures of propaganda and manipulation. But, in reality, revolutions are not made. They are the detonations of explosive materials, long accumulating and often long dormant. They are the resultants of a vast complex of economic, political, social, and legal forces, which taken collectively are the masters, not the servants, of statesmen and political agitators. They are never sudden in their origin, but look back to influences long in the making; and it is the business of the modern student of the subject to discover those remoter causes and to examine thoroughly and with an open mind the history, institutions, and mental past of the parties to the conflict. In pursuit of my purpose let me call to your attention certain aspects of that most important of all periods of our early history, the years from 1713 to 1775.

The middle period of the eighteenth century in England, resembling in some respects the mid-Victorian era of the next century, was intellectually, socially, and institutionally in a state of stable equilibrium. The impulses of the Revolution of 1689 had spent their force. English thought and life was tending to become formal, conventional, and artificial, and the English mind was acquiring the fatal habit of closing against novelty and change. The most enlightened men of the day regarded the existing order as the best that could be conceived, and in the main were content to let well enough alone.

Those who held the reins of power were comfortable and irresponsible, steeped in their "old vulgar prejudices", and addicted to habits and modes of living that were approved by age and precedent. The miseries of the poor were accepted as due to inherent viciousness; class distinctions were sharply marked, and social relations were cast in a rigid mould; while, as far as the mass of the poor was concerned, the vagrancy laws and the narrow policy of the corporate towns made free movement in any direction practically impossible. Life at large was characterized by brutality and a widespread sense of insecurity. Little thought was given to the education of the poor, the diseases of poverty and dirt, the baneful effects of overcrowding in the towns, or the corrupting influence of life in tenements and cellars. Excessive drinking and habitual resort to violence in human relations prevailed in urban sections; and while it is probably true that in rural districts, where life was simple and medieval, there was greater comfort and peace and less barbarity and coarseness, nevertheless, it is equally true that the scenes of English country life in the eighteenth century, that have come down to us in literature and painting, are more often conventional than real. Vested interests and the rights of property were deemed of greater importance than the rights of humanity, and society clung tenaciously to the old safeguards and defenses that checked the inrush of new ideas. There was a great absence of interest in technical invention and improvement. Because the landed classes were in the ascendant, agriculture was the only national interest receiving attention—drainage, rotation of crops, and the treatment of the soil being the only practical activities that attracted capital. The concerns and welfare of those without the right to vote were largely ignored; and it is no mere coincidence that the waste of human life, which was at its worst in London between 1720 and 1750, with the population of England declining during that period, should not have been checked until after 1780. The age was not one of progress in government, social organization, or humanitarianism; and it is important to note that the reconstruction of English manners and ways of living, and the movement leading to the diminution of crime, to sanitation, the greater abundance of food, and amelioration of living conditions—particularly in the towns and among the poorer classes—came after, and not before, the American Revolution.

The state of mind, to which were due the conditions thus described, permeated all phases of British life and government, and determined the attitude of the ruling classes toward the political, as well as the social, order. These classes were composed in a pre-

ponderant degree of landed proprietors, whose feeling of feudal superiority and tenacious adherence to the ideas and traditions of their class were determining factors in political life both in Parliament and the country. They believed that their institutions provided a sufficient panacea for all constitutional ills and could not imagine wherein these institutions needed serious revision. They were convinced that the existing system preserved men's liberties better than any that had gone before, and they wanted no experiments or dangerous leaps in the dark. They not only held as a tenet of faith that those who owned the land should wield political power, but they were certain that such an arrangement had the sanction of God. They revered the British system of government, its principles and philosophy, as the embodiment of human wisdom, grounded in righteousness and destined by nature to serve the purpose of man. They saw it admired abroad as the most enlightened government possessed by any nation in the world, and so credited it with their unprecedented prosperity and influence as a nation. They likened its critics to Milton's Lucifer, attacking "the sacred and immovable mount of the whole constitution", as a contemporary phrased it, and they guarded it as the Israelites guarded the ark of the covenant. Woe to him who would defile it!

Nor were they any less rigid in their attitude toward the colonies in America. Colonial policy had developed very slowly and did not take on systematic form until well on in the eighteenth century; but when once it became defined, the ruling classes regarded it in certain fundamental aspects—at least in official utterance—as fixed as was the constitution itself. At first England did not take her colonies seriously as assets of commercial importance, but when after 1704 naval stores were added to the tobacco and sugar of Virginia and the West Indies, and it was seen that these commodities enabled England to obtain a favorable balance of trade with European countries, the value of the plantations in British eyes increased enormously. However, it was not until after 1750, when a favorable balance of trade was reached with the colonies themselves, that the mercantilist deemed the situation entirely satisfactory; and from that time on for twenty years—epochal years in the history of England's relations with America—the mercantilist idea of the place that a colony should occupy in the British scheme of things became fixed and unalterable. Though the colonies were growing by leaps and bounds, the authorities in Great Britain retained unchanged the policy which had been adopted more than half a century before. They did not essentially alter the instructions to the Board of Trade

in all the eighty-six years of its existence. They created no true colonial secretary, even in 1768, and no department of any kind at any time for the exclusive oversight of American affairs. They saw no necessity for adopting new methods of managing colonial trade, even though the colonial situation was constantly presenting new problems for solution. Manufacturing was undoubtedly more discouraged in 1770 than it had been in 1699, when the first restrictive act was passed; and the idea that the colonies by their very nature were ordained to occupy a position of commercial dependence to the advantage and profit of the mother country was never more firmly fixed in the British mind than just before our Revolution. In fact, that event altered in no essential particular the British conception of the status of a colony, for as late as 1823, Sir Charles Ellis, undoubtedly voicing the opinion of his day, could say in Parliament that the colonial system of England had not been established for the sake of the colonies, but for the encouragement of British trade and manufactures. Thus for more than a century England's idea of what a colony should be underwent no important alteration whatever.

Equally unchangeable was the British idea of how a colony should be governed. In the long list of commissions and instructions drawn up in England for the guidance of the royal governors in America, there is to be found, with one exception only, nothing that indicates any progressive advance in the spirit and method of administration from 1696 to 1782. Year after year, the same arrangements and phraseology appear, conforming to a common type, admitting, it is true, important modifications in matters of detail, but in principle undergoing at no time in eighty-six years serious revision or reconstruction. These documents were drawn up in Whitehall according to a fixed pattern; the governors and councils were allowed no discretion; the popular assemblies were confined within the narrow bounds of inelastic formulae, which repeated, time after time, the same injunctions and the same commands; while the crown reserved to itself the full right of interference in all matters that were construed as coming under its prerogative. These instructions represented the rigid eighteenth-century idea of how a colony should be retained in dependence on the mother country. And what was true of the instructions was true of other documents also that had to do with America. For instance, the lists of queries to the governors, the questionnaires to the commodore-governors of the Newfoundland fishery, and the whole routine business of the fishery itself had become a matter of form and precedent, as conventional and stereotyped as were the polite phrases of eighteenth-century social inter-

course. Rarely was any attempt made to adapt these instructions to the needs of growing communities such as the colonies were showing themselves to be; and only with the Quebec instructions of 1775, issued after the passage of the Quebec Act and under the guidance of a colonial governor of unusual common-sense, was there any recognition of a new colonial situation. In this document, which appeared at the very end of our colonial period, do we find something of a break from the stiff and legalistic forms that were customary in the earlier royal instructions, some appreciation of the fact that the time was approaching when a colony should be treated with greater liberality and be allowed to have some part in saying how it should be administered.

Without going further with our analysis we can say that during the half-century preceding our Revolution English habits of thought and methods of administration and government, both at home and in the colonies, had reached a state of immobility. To all appearances the current of the national life had settled into a backwater, and as far as home affairs were concerned was seemingly becoming stagnant. At a time when Pitt was breaking France by land and sea, and men on waking were asking what new territories had been added during the night to the British dominions, occurrences at home were barren of adventure, either in society or politics. Ministers were not true statesmen; they had no policies, no future hopes, no spirit of advance, no gifts of foresight or prophecy. In all that concerned domestic interests, they were impervious to suggestions, even when phrased in the eloquence of Pitt and Burke. They wanted no change in existing conditions; their eyes were fixed on traditions and precedents rather than on the obligations and opportunities of the future. Their tenure of office was characterized by inactivity, a casual handling of situations they did not understand and could not control, and a willingness to let the ship of state drift for itself. As a modern critic has said, they were always turning in an unending circle, one out, one in, one in, one out, marking time and never going forward.

To a considerable extent the narrow point of view and rigidity of attitude exhibited by the men who held office at Whitehall or sat in Parliament at Westminster can be explained by the fact that at this time officials and members of Parliament were also territorial magnates, lords of manors, and country squires, who were influenced in their political life by ideas that governed their relations with their tenantry and the management of their landed estates. It is not necessary to think of them as bought by king or ministers and so bound and gagged against freedom of parliamentary action. In

fact, they were bound and gagged already by devotion to their feudal privileges, their family prerogatives, and their pride of landed proprietorship. They viewed the colonies somewhat in the light of tenancies of the crown, and as they themselves lived on the rents from their estates, so they believed that the king and the kingdom should profit from the revenues and returns from America. The point of view was somewhat that of a later Duke of Newcastle, who when reproached for compelling his tenants to vote as he pleased said that he had a right to do as he liked with his own. This landed aristocracy reflected the eighteenth-century spirit. It was sonorous, conventional, and self-satisfied, and shameless of sparkle or humor. It clung to the laws of inheritance and property, fearful of anything that might in any way offend the shades of past generations. In its criticism of the manners of others it was insular and arrogant, and was mentally so impenetrable as never to understand why any one, even in the colonies, should wish things to be other than they were or refuse to accept the station of life to which by Providence he had been called.

A government, representative of a privileged social and political order that took existing conditions as a matter of course, setting nature at defiance and depending wholly on art, was bound sooner or later to come into conflict with a people, whose life in America was in closest touch with nature and characterized by growth and change and constant readjustments. In that country were groups of men, women, and children, the greater portion of whom were of English ancestry, numbering at first a few hundreds and eventually more than two millions, who were scattered over many miles of continent and island and were living under various forms of government. These people, more or less unconsciously, under the influence of new surroundings and imperative needs, were establishing a new order of society and laying the foundations of a new political system. The story of how this was done—how that which was English slowly and imperceptibly merged into that which was American—has never been adequately told; but it is a fascinating phase of history, more interesting and enlightening when studied against the English background than when construed as an American problem only. It is the story of the gradual elimination of those elements, feudal and proprietary, that were foreign to the normal life of a frontier land, and of the gradual adjustment of the colonists to the restraints and restrictions that were imposed upon them by the commercial policy of the mother country. It is the story also of the growth of the colonial assemblies and of the education and experience that the

colonists were receiving in the art of political self-government. It is above all—and no phase of colonial history is of greater significance—the story of the gradual transformation of these assemblies from the provincial councils that the home government intended them to be into miniature parliaments. At the end of a long struggle with the prerogative and other forms of outside interference, they emerged powerful legislative bodies, as self-conscious in their way as the House of Commons in England was becoming during the same eventful years.

Here was an *impasse*, for the British view that a colonial assembly partook of the character of a provincial or municipal council was never actually true of any assembly in British America at any time in its history. From the beginning, each of these colonial bodies, in varying ways and under varying circumstances, assumed a position of leadership in its colony, and exercised, in a manner often as bewildering to the student of to-day as to an eighteenth-century royal governor, a great variety of executive, legislative, and judicial functions. Except in Connecticut and Rhode Island, requests for parliamentary privileges were made very early and were granted year after year by the governors—privileges that were essentially those of the English and Irish Houses of Commons and were consciously modelled after them. At times, the assemblies went beyond Parliament and made claims additional to the usual speaker's requests, claims first asked for as matters of favor but soon demanded as matters of right, as belonging to representative bodies and not acquired by royal gift or favor. One gets the impression that though the assemblies rarely failed to make the formal request, they did so with the intention of taking in any case what they asked for and anything more that they could secure. Gradually, with respect to privileges, they advanced to a position of amazing independence, freeing themselves step by step from the interfering power of the executive, that is, of the royal prerogative. They began to talk of these rights as ancient and inherent and necessary to the orderly existence of any representative body, and they became increasingly self-assertive and determined as the years passed.

Nor was this the only change affecting the assemblies to which the eighteenth-century Englishman was asked to adapt himself. The attitude of the assemblies in America found expression in the exercise of powers that had their origin in other sources than that of parliamentary privilege. They adopted rules of their own, that were sometimes even more severe than those of Parliament itself. They regulated membership, conduct, and procedure; ruled against drink-

ing, smoking, and profanity, against unseemly, unnecessary, and tedious debate, against absence, tardiness, and other forms of evasion. They punished with great severity all infringement of rules and acts of contempt, and defended their right to do so against the governor and council on one side and the courts of the colony on the other. Nor did they even pretend to be consistent in their opposition to the royal prerogative, as expressed in the instructions to the royal governors, and in their manœuvres they did not follow any uniform policy or plan. They conformed to these instructions willingly enough, whenever it was agreeable for them to do so; but if at any time they considered an instruction contrary to the best interest of a particular colony, they did not hesitate to oppose it directly or to nullify it by avoidance. In general, it may be said that they evaded or warded off or deliberately disobeyed such instructions as they did not like. Thus both consciously and unconsciously they were carving out a *lex parliamenti* of their own, which, evolving naturally from the necessity of meeting the demands of self-governing communities, carried them beyond the bounds of their own membership and made them responsible for the welfare of the colony at large.

The important point to remember is that the plan of governmental control as laid down in England was never in accord with the actual situation in America; that the Privy Council, the Secretary of State, and the Board of Trade seem not to have realized that their system of colonial administration was breaking down at every point. Their minds ran in a fixed groove and they could construe the instances of colonial disobedience and aggression, which they often noted, in no other terms than those of persistent dereliction of duty. Either they did not see or else refused to see the wide divergence that was taking place between colonial administration as they planned it and colonial administration as the colonists were working it out. Englishmen saw in the American claims an attack upon an old, established, and approved system. They interpreted the attitude of the colonists as something radical and revolutionary, menacing British prosperity, British political integrity, and the British scheme of colonial government. Opposed by tradition and conviction to new experiments, even at home, they were unable to sympathize with, or even to understand, the great experiment, one of the greatest in the world's history, on trial across the sea. There in America was evolving a new idea of sovereignty, inherent not in crown and Parliament but in the people of a state, based on the principle—self-evident it may be to us to-day but not to the Englishman of the eighteenth century—that governments derive their just powers from the con-

sent of the governed. There was emerging a new idea of the franchise, as a natural right, under certain conditions, of every adult citizen, an idea which theoretically is not even yet accepted in Great Britain. There was being established a new order of society, without caste or privilege, free from economic restrictions and social demarcations between class and class. There was taking shape a new idea of a colony, a self-governing dominion, the members of which were competent to develop along their own lines, while working together with the mother country as part of a common state.

For us to-day with our perspective it is easy to see the conflict approaching and some of us may think perhaps that the British ministers and members of Parliament ought to have realized that their own ideas and systems were fast outgrowing their usefulness even for Great Britain herself; and that their inflexible views of the colonial relationship were fast leading to disaster. Yet we must keep in mind that it is always extraordinarily difficult for a generation reared in the environment of modern democracy to deal sympathetically with the Englishman's point of view in the eighteenth century, or to understand why the ruling classes of that day so strenuously opposed the advance of liberalism both in England and America. The fact remains, however, that the privileged and governing classes in England saw none of these things. They were too close to events and too much a part of them to judge them dispassionately or to appreciate their real significance. These classes, within which we may well include the Loyalists in America, were possessed of inherited instincts, sentiments, and prejudices which they could no more change than they could have changed the color of their eyes or the texture of their skins. That which existed in government and society was to them a part of the fixed scheme of nature, and no more called for reconsideration than did the rising of the sun or the budding of the trees in spring. If Lord North had granted the claims of the colonists he probably would have been looked on by Parliament as having betrayed the constitution and impaired its stability, just as Peel was pilloried by a similar landowning Parliament in 1845, when he advocated the repeal of the corn laws. One has only to read the later debates on the subject of enclosures and the corn laws to understand the attitude of the British landowners toward the colonies from 1763 to 1776. To them in each instance it seemed as if the foundations of the universe were breaking up and the world in which they lived was sinking beneath their feet.

Primarily, the American Revolution was a political and constitutional movement and only secondarily one that was either financial, commercial, or social. At bottom the fundamental issue was the political independence of the colonies, and in the last analysis the conflict lay between the British Parliament and the colonial assemblies, each of which was probably more sensitive, self-conscious, and self-important than was the voting population that it represented. For many years these assemblies had fought the prerogative successfully and would have continued to do so, eventually reducing it to a minimum, as the later self-governing dominions have done; but in the end it was Parliament, whose powers they disputed, that became the great antagonist. Canning saw the situation clearly when, half a century later, he spoke of the Revolution as having been a test of the equality of strength "between the legislature of this mighty kingdom . . . and the colonial assemblies", adding further that he had no intention of repeating in the case of Jamaica, the colony then under debate, the mistakes that had been made in 1776. Of the mistakes to which he referred the greatest was the employment of the deadly expedient of coercion, and he showed his greater wisdom when he determined, as he said, to keep back "within the penetralia of the constitution the transcendental powers of Parliament over a dependency of the British crown" and not "to produce it upon trifling occasions or in cases of petty refractoriness and temporary misconduct". How he would have met the revolution in America, based as it was on "the fundamental principles of political liberty", we cannot say; but we know that he had no sympathy with any attempt to force opinion back into paths that were outworn. That he would have foreseen the solution of a later date and have granted the colonies absolute and responsible self-government, recognizing the equality of the assemblies in domestic matters and giving them the same control over their home affairs as the people of Great Britain had over theirs, can be conjectured only by inference from his liberal attitude toward the South American republics. He stood half-way between the ministers of the Revolutionary period—blind, sensitive, and mentally unprogressive—and the statesmen of the middle of the nineteenth century, who were willing to follow the lead of those courageous and far-sighted Englishmen who saved the empire from a second catastrophe after 1830 and were the founders of the British colonial policy of to-day.

The revolt of the colonies from Great Britain began long before the battles of Moore's Creek Bridge and Lexington; before the time of James Otis and the writs of assistance; before the dispute over

the appointment of judges in North Carolina and New York; before the eloquence of Patrick Henry was first heard in the land; and even before the quarrel in Virginia over the Dinwiddie pistole fee. These were but the outward and visible signs of an inward and factual divergence. The separation from the mother country began just as soon as the mercantile system of commercial control, the governmental system of colonial administration, and the whole doctrine of the inferior status of a colonial assembly began to give way before the pressure exerted and the disruptive power exercised by these young and growing colonial communities. New soil had produced new wants, new desires, new points of view, and the colonists were demanding the right to live their own lives in their own way. As we see it to-day the situation was a dramatic one. On one side was the immutable, stereotyped system of the mother country, based on precedent and tradition and designed to keep things comfortably as they were; on the other, a vital, dynamic organism, containing the seed of a great nation, its forces untried, still to be proved. It is inconceivable that a connection should have continued long between two such yokefellows, one static, the other dynamic, separated by an ocean and bound only by the ties of a legal relationship.

If my diagnosis is correct of the British state of mind in the eighteenth century, and the evidence in its favor seems overwhelming, then the colonists were as justified in their movement of revolt as were the Englishmen themselves in their movement for reform in the next century. Yet in reality no great progressive movement needs justification at our hands, for great causes justify themselves and time renders the decision. The revolt in America and the later reforms in Great Britain herself were directed against the same dominant ruling class that in their colonial relations as well as in their social and political arrangements at home preferred that the world in which they lived should remain as it was. Reform or revolt is bound to follow attempts of a privileged class to conduct affairs according to unchanging rules and formulae. The colonies had developed a constitutional organization equally complete with Britain's own and one that in principle was far in advance of the British system, and they were qualified to co-operate with the mother country on terms similar to those of a brotherhood of free nations such as the British world is becoming to-day. But England was unable to see this fact or unwilling to recognize it, and consequently America became the scene of a political unrest, which might have been controlled by compromise, but was turned to revolt by coercion. The situation is a very interesting one, for England is famous for

her ability to compromise at critical moments in her history. For once at least she failed. In 1832 and later years, when she faced other great constitutional crises at home and in her colonies, she saved herself from revolution by understanding the situation and adjusting herself to it. Progress may be stemmed for a time, but it cannot be permanently stopped by force. A novelist has expressed the idea in saying: "You cannot fight and beat revolutions as you can fight and beat nations. You can kill a man, but you simply can't kill a rebel. For the proper rebel has an ideal of living, while your ideal is to kill him so that you may preserve yourself. And the reason why no revolution or religion has ever been beaten is that rebels die for something worth dying for, the future, but their enemies die only to preserve the past, and makers of history are always stronger than makers of empire." The American revolutionists had an ideal of living; it can hardly be said that in 1776 the Englishmen of the ruling classes were governed in their colonial relations by any ideals that were destined to be of service to the future of the human race.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

ROMAN PARTIES IN THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS

FROM several passages in Tacitus it is evident that during the reign of Tiberius there were bitter party struggles in Rome. In his account of the year 17 A.D. the historian says: "the court was torn asunder by a secret rivalry between the partisans of Drusus and Germanicus. Tiberius was partial to Drusus, as his own son, and of his own blood; but Germanicus was the more popular of the two, not only because his uncle hated him, but also by reason of his more illustrious birth on the mother's side. . . . Yet the two brothers lived on terms of beautiful harmony together, unshaken by the rivalries of those around them."¹ After the death of both these princes Tacitus says: "Sejanus was for ever dropping insinuations like these into his [Tiberius's] ear: 'The state was divided into two factions, as if in civil war; there were some who styled themselves the party of Agrippina; if this were allowed to go on, their numbers would increase; there was but one mode of curbing the rising spirit of disaffection—to put one or two of its most active promoters out of the way.'"² From other expressions of Tacitus we gather that Sejanus sought to form a party of his own in the senate by the use of the imperial patronage.³

We can thus identify three parties, at least, first the party of Germanicus and Agrippina, second the party of Drusus, and third that of Sejanus. It is clear that the party of Germanicus was unfriendly to Tiberius, and from this we may infer that the party of Drusus was in the main identical with that which supported the emperor.⁴ Unfortunately the historian has given us no information as to the nature of these parties and little as to their activities. Yet it is obvious that a better understanding of them would throw some light on the history of the period. When modern scholars have noticed them at all they have been content either to repeat the little that Tacitus has said or to indulge in *a priori* conjectures. It may, therefore, be worth while to examine the whole matter and see if any

¹ Tacitus, *Annals*, II. 43. Here and elsewhere I quote from Ramsay's excellent translation. All references to Tacitus are to the *Annals*.

² Tac., IV. 17.

³ Tac., IV. 2 and 68.

⁴ H. Schiller, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (Gotha, 1883–1887), I. 295, suggests that there was a party of Livia. This is possible, but it was probably a group within the party of Tiberius and Drusus.

facts remain which will throw light on the question. Lacking a positive statement from Tacitus, we cannot hope to reach any absolutely certain conclusions. All that can be expected is that we may find that such facts as we can gather point in some definite direction.

Before proceeding further it will be well to fix a few dates clearly in mind. In 4 A.D. Augustus formally adopted Tiberius as his son and sent him to take charge of the military operations on the northern frontier. It was not till 11 that Tiberius returned to Rome and after this he seems to have been given general charge of the government by the aged emperor. We may, therefore, date the reign of Tiberius from 10, when his influence apparently became dominant, instead of from 14, when he nominally succeeded to the throne. At his formal accession his presumptive heir, Germanicus, was commanding on the Rhine. This prince was recalled to Rome in the winter of 16 and, after a splendid triumph, was despatched to the East where he died in 19. Tiberius withdrew to Capri in 27, leaving Sejanus as his representative in Rome, and in 31 occurred the overthrow of that minister.

The first evidence as to the character of the parties is to be found in the consular *fasti* and it will be well to examine them in some detail as they have never, so far as I know, been studied from this point of view. Obviously the consuls for any year might be taken from families already of consular rank, or from those which had never gained such distinction. These last would include three more or less distinct classes. In the lowest place would be the new men, that is, men belonging to families not hitherto of noble rank. Above them would stand men of noble families but families which had never risen above the praetorship. In this class a distinction might be felt between a family which had acquired nobility under the republic and one which had only gained curule office under the empire. How great this distinction would be it is impossible to say, but it may be well to separate this class from the others when possible. Such separation can be only partial, however, as the praetorian *fasti* are incomplete and family relationships are sometimes uncertain. Thus in 17 we find as consul C. Caelius Rufus. Now there were Caelii Rufi in the days of Cicero, of whom one was named praetor by Caesar and another was tribune in 55 B.C. If the consul for 17 was descended from either, it is possible that his family had gained noble rank under the republic apart from Caesar's appointment. If we assume this and call men like Caelius Rufus members of old praetorian families, the meaning of the term will be clear enough. Men whose families cannot be traced back to a noble house

of republican times we may group together as lesser nobles and new men, since we can seldom distinguish the two classes. The consular families would probably resent the promotion of an old praetorian family less than that of a new or recent one. Still, if a family had never risen to the consulship before, it is likely that it owed its advancement more to the emperor than to the consular nobility. I think, therefore, that we ought to consider the old praetorian families with the lesser nobles as forming a single class. We may, perhaps, safely assume that the consular families did not wish their number increased, while the lesser nobles were eager for advancement. Such feelings would be natural in any aristocracy, and they certainly existed under the republic.

Turning now to the *fasti*, a short table will furnish the best basis for discussion. From 4 to 37 the consuls, omitting the emperor and members of the imperial house, may be classified as follows:⁵

Years	Number of years	Members of consular families	Members of old praetorian families	Lesser nobles and new men
4-9.....	6	9	2	11 ⁶
10-15.....	6	13		2 ⁷
16-19.....	4	5	2 ⁸	10
20-27.....	8	16 ⁹		4
28-31.....	4	11	1	7
32-37.....	6	7	1	6

⁵ In this table and in the discussion which follows I have followed W. Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares Imperii Romani* (Bonn, 1909). Earlier editors, as J. Klein, *Fasti Consulares inde a Caesaris Nece usque ad Imperium Diocletiani* (Leipzig, 1881), arrange the names somewhat differently, but the differences are not of importance for the present purpose. My classification can be checked by reference to Liebenam and to Klebs, Dessau, and de Rohden, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (Berlin, 1897-1898). Other sources are indicated when necessary.

⁶ C. Ateius Capito, cos. 5, is doubtful. His grandfather was a centurion under Sulla, while his father was quaestor in 55 B.C. and ultimately became praetor; P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la République Romaine*, I. (Louvain, 1885) 537. Tac., III. 75, implies that he was not regarded as of high rank. I have, therefore, assumed that his father gained the praetorship after the fall of the republic and have put him in the class of lesser nobles. If this period is extended to 11 and the next shortened to 12-15, the results are not materially changed.

⁷ In 13 there was a consul whose name has been lost except for the last three letters.

⁸ The two men here in question are the Caelius Rufus already discussed and Vibius Marsus. Of this last Tacitus (VI. 47) says that he was of an old and distinguished family. As the consular *fasti* show only three Vibii, none of whom bears the name of Marsus, I have classified him as a member of an old praetorian family.

⁹ Two of the sixteen are somewhat doubtful. Of one of these we have only a few letters of the name. Modern scholars have, however, restored the name

An examination of this table will show a marked difference in the character of the consuls in the several periods. While Tiberius is absent on the frontier (4 to 9 inclusive) the lesser nobles and new men are promoted with great frequency.¹⁰ When his return to Rome is near at hand there is a change. Very few such promotions now occur and the families already consular enjoy an almost complete monopoly of the office. The recall of Germanicus brings another change and the lesser nobles regain the favor of the government. This they lose with his death and the consular families recover their former predominance. Not until after the retirement of Tiberius to Capri do the lesser nobles come back into some degree of favor. In the last part of the reign the two classes seem very equally balanced. As the fall of Sejanus had exercised a powerful disturbing influence we may for the present disregard this final period.

On the face of it these changes seem to show that Tiberius was strongly inclined to favor the higher aristocracy. Certainly from his return to Rome till his withdrawal to Capri the consular families hold a very marked predominance among the consuls except during the years from 16 to 19 inclusive, and this is just the time when, if Germanicus ever had any influence on the choice of the consuls, we should expect to find some traces of it. He was recalled from Germany in 16, but the emperor took pains to bring him back without any appearance of disgrace. He was allowed a splendid triumph and despatched to the East on a mission which was, outwardly at least, one of great honor and distinction. Under these circumstances it would not be strange if promotions were freely given to his friends and partisans as a measure of conciliation.

A closer examination of the *fasti* for these years makes such a supposition seem still more probable. In 16, before Germanicus had actually returned, there were six consuls, equally divided between the higher and the lower nobility. During 17, while he was in Rome for his triumph, there were four, all of whom were from the lesser nobility. In 18, after his departure for the East, he and Tiberius nominally assumed the office on January 1, but, as Germanicus was as P. Cornelius Lentulus, and, if this is correct, it would seem probable that he was a member of the aristocratic house of the Lentuli. The other is a certain Ser. Cornelius Cethegus. This name was borne by an old republican house, but one which had not recently been able, if it had survived, to reach the consulship. There was also in the days of the early empire a branch of the Cornelii Lentuli who bore the additional name of Cethegus (see Groag in Pauly-Wissowa, IV. 1277 and 1379).

¹⁰ The favor shown to the lesser nobles and new men in this period may have been due largely to the frontier wars. This will be discussed more fully later. If Tiberius was consulted he may have favored it, against his natural inclinations, for military reasons.

absent and Tiberius retired in a few days, the real consuls for the year were the *consules suffecti*, of whom there were four, all lesser nobles. The list of consuls for 18 had probably been settled, if the elections had not actually been held, before Germanicus left Rome, and in 19 the emperor reverted to his former policy, giving the consulship to two old nobles and one new man. The influence of Germanicus thus seems to furnish an explanation of the character of the consuls for these four years, and this would strongly suggest that his partisans came mainly from the lesser nobility, while those of Tiberius and Drusus were drawn chiefly from the higher aristocracy. It is only when the influence of Sejanus became dominant that we find the lesser nobles again coming into favor, for the influence of Sejanus, like that of Germanicus, seems to have been thrown upon their side.

Such conclusions would be much more trustworthy if the consular *fasti* were complete, but unfortunately they are not. There are years where it is clear that we do not have the names of all the consuls (21, for example) and there are a number of men who are known to have held the office but in what year is uncertain. Of these consuls *anno incerto* I have been able to find the names of eighteen whose consulship, either certainly or possibly, fell within the limits of the table given above. Of these nine belonged to the higher nobility and nine to the lesser. The insertion of all of either group in any one period is quite impossible and the arbitrary assignment to any period of all the members of either group who could possibly come there would change the numbers, but would not materially affect the significance of the table.¹¹ If, for example, all the lesser nobles who can possibly have held the consulship between 20 and 27 are placed in that period, the higher nobles would still predominate and it would still be true that fewer of the lesser nobles had been promoted during these eight years than in the preceding four. Thus the general in-

¹¹ The names of these consuls *anno incerto*, with such information as we have of the date of their consulship, are here given. Members of consular families—Annius Vinicianus (before 32), L. Calpurnius Piso (before 25), Caninius Rebilus (under Tiberius), M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus (praetor in 19, hence consul in 22 or later), M. Cocceius Nerva (before 24), Junius Blaesus (soon after 28), M. Lollius (early in first century), C. Passienus Crispus (I. ? II. 44), C. Vibius Rufinus (either before 24, or shortly before 43). Lesser nobles or new men—Annius Pollio (with Rubellius Blandus before 21), Caecina Paetus (before 42), A. Didius Gallus (before 38), Q. Haterius (before 16), C. Octavius Laenas (before 34), M. Porcius Cato (between 28 and 38), C. Rubellius Blandus (before 21), D. Valerius Asiaticus (before 41), Cluvius Rufus (before 41). Of these several may have held the office under Caligula rather than Tiberius. The details and references will be found in the *Prosopographia* and in the Index Nominum of Liebenam's *Fasti*.

ferences based upon the table are in reality more reliable than the unquestionable inaccuracy of the figures might at first sight lead one to suppose.

Whatever value we may attach to the testimony of the *fasti* as to the character of the parties, it is confirmed by facts drawn from other sources. Few of the known supporters of Germanicus belonged to the higher aristocracy. As he was the heir presumptive to the throne and as the imperial family was widely related by marriage to the great Roman houses, we very naturally find that a number of men coming from consular families are mentioned in connection with him. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Asinius Gallus, Metellus Creticus Silanus, Quinctilius Varus the younger,¹² and Haterius Agrippa were all, in one way or another, related, while Sex. Pompeius and Sentius Saturninus may have been his friends, but none of them seem to have been active partisans. Of his legates in Germany there is nothing to connect any with his party except C. Silius, who thus stands almost, if not quite, alone.¹³

The trial of Piso is somewhat suggestive in this connection. The prosecution was conducted by four men, three of whom, Q. Veranius, Q. Servaeus, and P. Vitellius, were friends of Germanicus who had accompanied him to the East, while the fourth, Fulcinius Trio, forced himself into the case after Agrippina and her friends had returned to Rome.¹⁴ Now all these champions were lesser nobles if not new men. On the other hand Piso sought his defenders chiefly from the higher aristocracy. At first he asked L. Arruntius, P. Vinicius, Asinius Gallus, Marcellus Aeserninus, and Sex. Pompeius to defend him, but all five declined. They were all members of consular families and all but Marcellus were actual consulars. The three men who undertook his defense were Manius Lepidus, L. Piso, and Livineius Regulus.¹⁵ The first two were members of old consular families, while the last belonged to a family that had gained praetorian rank in the last days of the republic. It looks as if Piso had expected the support of the Drusan-Tiberian party against that of Germanicus, but that some of its members shrank from a conflict on such an issue.

¹² Varus and his mother Claudia Pulchra were prosecuted and Tacitus represents the prosecution of Claudia as an attack on Agrippina. Tac., IV. 52 and 66.

¹³ The others were L. Apronius, A. Caecina Severus, and Seius Tubero.

¹⁴ Tac., III. 10 and 13.

¹⁵ Tac., III. 11. Both Furneaux and Nipperdey in their editions of the *Annals* state in their notes to this passage that Livineius also was a consular. I have been unable to find the grounds for this assertion. He was descended from a friend of Cicero whom Willems (*Le Sénat*, I. 471) makes a praetorian senator in 55 B.C. I have found no evidence that the family rose higher.

The few other men in any way connected with Germanicus were all lesser nobles or new men. Seius Tubero, his legate in Germany, was probably the son of a knight,¹⁶ and, though raised to the consulship in 18, was a personal friend of Tiberius. P. Suillius Rufus, a quaestor of Germanicus in Syria, was banished by Tiberius and recalled by Caligula. Vibius Marsus, a legate in the East, returned with Agrippina to Rome, but seems to have taken no part in the prosecution of Piso. He was probably a member of an old praetorian family and had gained the consulship in 17. The last partisan of whom we hear was Titius Sabinus, a Roman knight. Thus the character of his known supporters seems to confirm the impression given by the *fasti* that the partisans of Germanicus were drawn chiefly from the lesser nobles.

There is another consideration which points in the same direction. Germanicus distinctly stood for a forward policy on the frontiers and aimed at the conquest of Germany, to all of which Tiberius was opposed. Now an aggressive frontier policy might very well appeal to the lesser nobles as opening up a better prospect of rapid advancement. In recent years a condition of war on the frontiers had apparently had this result. The Rhine-Danube frontier had been the scene of serious fighting from 4 to 16 and the *fasti* seem to show plain traces of it. In 3 Aelius Lamia, belonging to an old praetorian family, was made consul and the next year we find him commanding in Illyricum. In 6 Nonius Asprenas, probably also of an old praetorian family, was consul and was immediately despatched to Germany. In 8 L. Apronius was recalled from Pannonia to hold the consulship and in 14 we find him on the German frontier. In 9 Poppaeus Sabinus, like Apronius a new man, gained the consulship and two years later was in charge of Moesia. In these cases we can hardly doubt that the needs of the imperial service were a factor in the advancement of the men in question. In two other instances we may suspect something of the kind. Vibius Postumus, consul in 5, was in Dalmatia in 9, and Junius Blaesus, consul in 10, was serving in Pannonia in 14. We do not know when either man took up his duties, but it must have been earlier than the casual mention which shows him in the province and both may have left Rome soon after their consulship.

Before this Augustus had shown no such marked favor to the lesser nobles. In the twelve years which preceded the adoption of Tiberius and the renewal of the frontier wars (from 9 B.C. to 3 A.D. inclusive) there had been thirty-one consuls, not counting the

¹⁶ See the *Prosopographia* under Seius Strabo; for the other details see the same under the proper names.

emperor himself or members of his family. Of these twenty-three were from consular families, two from old praetorian families, and six were lesser nobles or new men. The policy of Augustus from 4 to 9, therefore, stood out in marked contrast to his policy before this time and to that of Tiberius after it. Clearly an aggressive frontier policy gave the lesser nobles a much better chance of promotion. Because the duties of the consuls in Rome had come to be of rather slight importance most historians have overlooked the real significance of the office. In a certain sense it was the pivot of the imperial constitution, but its significance lay rather in the rank which it conferred than in the powers attached to it. Not only did the consular hold a higher and more dignified place in the senate, but in aristocratic society as well, which social distinction was shared in and inherited by his family. Nor was this all. Custom, if not law, required that all the chief commands in the army and all the most important governorships in the imperial provinces should be given to consulars. If a new man failed to gain the consulship, he was not only relegated to an inferior place in the senate and in Roman society, but he was debarred from all the highest offices in the state. Obviously, if the existing consular families could keep control of the consulship, they would automatically secure for themselves the cream of the imperial patronage. It was only natural that they should desire this and we may safely assume that they were opposed to the frequent promotion of the lesser nobles.

It is true that Tacitus has recorded a complaint of Tiberius that he had been forced to entreat consulars to accept provincial commands,¹⁷ but, even if the complaint were well founded, and Tacitus clearly does not think it was, it would not be inconsistent with what has just been said. Individuals might be reluctant to leave Rome themselves while yet clinging tenaciously to the social prestige and political privileges of their class. In 1911 many English peers were eager to defend the powers of the House of Lords who seldom attended its sessions, and they finally submitted to the Parliament Act partly to save the social distinction conferred upon them by their titles. If the existing consular families opposed an increase in their number, it was natural that the lesser nobles should strive to push themselves forward and should desire a career open to merit, more or less regardless of birth. Viewed from this standpoint the continuation of the German war would be to their advantage. If they had as yet gained little from it, they could hope that, if it were prolonged, it would force some of them to the front, and, if Germany were conquered, the number of provinces to be held by consulars

¹⁷ Tac., VI. 27.

would be increased. It seems to me that Asbach is only half right when he styles the recall of Germanicus a blow to the nobility, because he has failed to note the different interests of the two sections of the aristocracy.¹⁸

If the party of Germanicus and Agrippina found its chief support among the lesser nobles, and that of Tiberius and Drusus was drawn mainly from the higher aristocracy, what may we infer as to the party of Sejanus? That the great consular houses would accept a new man as their leader seems hardly likely, even though politics sometimes produces strange combinations; it appears more probable that his partisans were drawn from the same class as those of Germanicus. Four friends of Germanicus took an active part in the prosecution of Piso, namely, Q. Veranius, Q. Servaeus, P. Vitellius, and Fulcinus Trio. Of these four men Veranius disappears from history after the trial, but the other three were all involved in the ruin of Sejanus as his friends.¹⁹ It is clear, therefore, that some, at least, of the lesser nobles who had supported Germanicus afterwards went over to Sejanus, which suggests that the two parties were composed of the same elements.

This suggestion is confirmed by a passage in Tacitus in which, in speaking of the four praetorian senators who betrayed Titius Sabinus, he says: "all four were ambitious of the consulship; there was no access to that office save through Sejanus, and the good-will of Sejanus was only to be gained by crime."²⁰ If Tacitus means that no one could obtain the consulship except through the favor of the minister he has apparently exaggerated, but if he means that the lesser nobles could only reach it in this way he may well be correct. From 28 to 31 inclusive, when the power of Sejanus was at its height, certainly eleven, and probably thirteen,²¹ members of consular families enjoyed the honor and in the case of eight of them there is no reason to suspect any connection with Sejanus. During these same years, however, one member of an old praetorian family²² and seven, possibly eight,²³ lesser nobles gained the consulship. One of these

¹⁸ J. Asbach, *Römisches Kaisertum und Verfassung bis auf Trajan* (Cologne, 1896), p. 14.

¹⁹ For Servaeus see Tac., VI. 7; for Vitellius, Tac., V. 8; for Fulcinus, Tac., V. 11, VI. 4 and 38, also Dio, LVIII. 9 and 25.

²⁰ Tac., IV. 68.

²¹ The younger Blaesus and Annius Vinicianus, consuls *anno incerto*, probably came within this period.

²² This was A. Plautius. One branch of the family, the Plautii Silvani, had reached the consulship, but that to which this Plautius belonged had never risen above the praetorship.

²³ The eighth was M. Porcius Cato, one of the betrayers of Titius Sabinus, who was consul between 28 and 38, perhaps in this period.

was Sejanus himself and one was an enemy of his, but he may have had something to do with the success of the five or six others. In the three years before 31 as many of the lesser nobles were promoted as in the eight years preceding, so that it seems clear that the influence of the minister was favorable to men of this class. In a word the members of the higher aristocracy could apparently trust to Tiberius for advancement, but the lesser nobles, and the four men who betrayed Titius Sabinus were such,²⁴ had little to expect without the backing of Sejanus.

The names of the other supporters of Sejanus bear out the conclusions so far reached. Few of the higher aristocracy were connected with him in any way. It may be well to enumerate briefly those whom there is any reason to think friendly to him. Mam. Aemilius Scaurus is mentioned by Tacitus as a friend.²⁵ Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus had a daughter who was betrothed to a son of Sejanus, but he later declared that he had only consented to this at the request of Tiberius himself.²⁶ Appius Junius Silanus and Calvisius Sabinus were both prosecuted after the minister's overthrow, but both were promptly acquitted.²⁷ In addition to these men whose families were consular under the republic,²⁸ there were others whose dignity was more recent. Of these the most important was L. Apronius, whose son was a friend of Sejanus.²⁹ There was also Fufius Geminus,³⁰ who owed his promotion to Livia, but whose wife was involved in the intrigues of Sejanus, and Q. Junius Baesus, an uncle of the minister, with his two sons. Perhaps we should also count Tarius Gratianus, a senator of praetorian rank but possibly a son of the Tarius Rufus who was consul in 16 B.C.³¹ If he was so related, he may have joined Sejanus in despair at his own failure to reach the consulship in his turn. Lastly, there were Anniius Pollio and his son Anniius Vinicianus, the one consul before 21 and the other before 32. Both were indicted after the fall of Sejanus but they were never brought to trial.³²

²⁴ Unless the Cato above came from the old family of that name. Had he done so it seems likely that Tacitus would have mentioned the fact, as he does in the case of Furius Camillus (Tac., II. 52).

²⁵ Tac., VI. 29.

²⁶ Tac., VI. 30.

²⁷ Tac., VI. 9.

²⁸ We should, perhaps, add Asinius Gallus. Dio, LVIII. 3, says he tried to gain the favor of Sejanus, but Tac., IV. 71, implies that he met with no success.

²⁹ Dio, LVIII. 19, and the *Prosopographia* under Apronius Caesianus.

³⁰ I think he was undoubtedly the son of the consul for 2 B.C. given in Liebenam's *Fasti*. For the other details see Tac., V. 2 and IV. 12; also Dio, LVIII. 4.

³¹ For the relationship see the *Prosopographia*.

³² Tac., VI. 9.

The connection of some of these men with Sejanus was slight and in several cases we have no good grounds for suspecting any at all. Yet there was at the time no lack of old nobles in Rome. There were twenty-one consulars belonging to the higher aristocracy who are known to have been alive after the death of Sejanus. Besides these there were the nobles of old families, about eleven in number, who held the consulship between 31 and 41 and who must, therefore, have been old enough to take a part in politics in 31. In addition there were an uncertain number of consulars from distinguished families the date of whose death is unknown but who, as far as age is concerned, may well have been alive and active during his days of power, and of these there were at least twenty-two. It would thus appear that, if Sejanus tried to win over the higher nobility, he met with little success. The great Roman houses are hardly represented among his followers, and, of the few of this class who might seem connected with him, most were not injured by his fall. Neither Gaetulicus nor Apronius was removed from his command, and four consulars who were indicted were either acquitted or the case allowed to drop.³³ Mam. Scaurus and Asinius Gallus, indeed, perished, but Tacitus expressly says that the fate of Scaurus was not due to his friendship with Sejanus and implies that the ruin of Gallus resulted from the personal hatred of Tiberius.³⁴ Fufius Geminus, the Blaesi, and Fulcinus Trio³⁵ were the only consulars involved in the ruin of the minister and all of them were closely connected with him, as we have seen.

Historians have seldom observed the fact that the Tiberian terror hardly touched the great Roman families. Nearly all the victims were from the lesser nobility or the knights. Of the lesser nobles who suffered for their friendship with Sejanus we find among praetorian senators Latinus Latiaris,³⁶ P. Vitellius,³⁷ Q. Servaeus, Sextius Paconianus, and probably Sex. Vistilius;³⁸ among senators of lower or unknown rank Brutteditius Niger,³⁹ T. Ollius,⁴⁰ and Pom-

³³ L. Arruntius and Cotta Messalinus were prosecuted, the one perhaps before, the other certainly after, the fall of Sejanus, but both were acquitted (Tac., VI. 5 and 7). The later prosecution of Arruntius, Domitius Ahenobarbus, and Vibius Marsus for impiety toward Tiberius probably had nothing to do with Sejanus as it was attributed to Macro's hatred of Arruntius (Tac., VI. 47-48). The suicide of C. Sulpicius Galba seems clearly unconnected with Sejanus (Tac., VI. 40, and Suetonius, *Galba*, 3).

³⁴ Tac., VI. 29 and IV. 71; also Dio, LVII. 2.

³⁵ Fulcinus was only made consul in 31, probably through Sejanus.

³⁶ Tac., IV. 68 and VI. 4; also Dio, LVIII. 1.

³⁷ Tac., V. 8, and Suetonius, *Vitellius*, 2.

³⁸ For the three see Tac., VI. 7, 3, 9 and 3.

³⁹ Tac., III. 66, and Juvenal, *Satires*, X. 81.

⁴⁰ Tac., XIII. 45, and Suetonius, *Nero*, 35.

ponius Secundus;⁴¹ among the knights there were at least four and probably six.⁴² Many others, of course, perished in the last six years of the reign, but we cannot be sure that it was because of their relations with Sejanus. This was no doubt the case with many, but to add their names would only strengthen our conclusion. If the rank of those punished after the fall of the minister is any indication, his party was mainly composed of men from the lower ranks. Either that, or Tiberius did not dare, perhaps did not wish, to deal harshly with the higher aristocracy, and it seems far more likely that they were not seriously implicated in the plots of Sejanus.

There are also some points in the government of the provinces which seem suggestive, though they have escaped the notice of historians. The precise nature of the treason of Sejanus is doubtful. He may have plotted to murder Tiberius and seize the throne, but certainly he counted on being the next emperor, even if he had no definite intention of harming his aged master. For success he must place the armies in the hands of men who would acquiesce in his accession. But these commands were always held by consulars, and in 28 Sejanus seems to have had few real friends of this rank. This was a difficulty to be overcome. The most important armies were those along the Rhine, eight legions in all, four in Upper and four in Lower Germany. In 29 the command in Upper Germany was given to Lentulus Gaetulicus, whose daughter was betrothed to a son of Sejanus, either before or after his appointment.⁴³ A short time before, Lower Germany was intrusted to L. Apronius, whose son was a friend of the minister and who was the father-in-law of Gaetulicus. The armies on the Rhine might thus be counted on, since both men would probably accept Sejanus as emperor for family reasons. Across the Adriatic was the province of Dalmatia and along the Danube were Pannonia and Moesia. In each of the three a force of two legions was stationed, and, if united, they would form a powerful army. But of such union there was little chance, as Moesia, at least, was in safe hands. The supreme command over Macedonia, Moesia, and Achaia had long been held by Poppaeus Sabinus,⁴⁴

⁴¹ Tac., V. 8, and Dio, LIX. 6. Dio errs in calling him a consular. He was consul in 44 (see the *Prosopographia*).

⁴² For the knights see Tac., VI. 7, 8, 10, 14. Tacitus would certainly not omit consulars in favor of knights. His list of the lesser victims is doubtless incomplete, but of the higher nobles I feel sure that we lack only those whose names were mentioned in the lost parts of books V. and VI.

⁴³ Tac., VI. 30. The date of the betrothal is unknown.

⁴⁴ W. Liebenam, *Die Legaten in der Römischen Provinzen von Augustus bis Diocletian* (Leipzig, 1888), holds that Sabinus had only Macedonia and Achaia at this time and that Labeo was an independent governor. I agree, however, with

whose daughter, and so far as we know his only child, had married T. Ollius, who was a friend of Sejanus.⁴⁵ The immediate charge of Moesia had been assigned to Pomponius Labeo, an officer of praetorian rank, though Sabinus had some troops in Macedonia or elsewhere under his direct authority.⁴⁶ In 34 Labeo killed himself and Tiberius informed the senate that, according to the old Roman custom, he had broken off all friendly relations with Labeo, who was accused of misgovernment in his province and other crimes.⁴⁷ In no other case of a governor accused of maladministration had Tiberius renounced all friendship with the accused, and his doing so in this case suggests strongly that Labeo had been in league with Sejanus. As Labeo had been in Moesia for eight years we can readily explain the delay in taking action by supposing that Tiberius had only suspected him after the intrigues of the dead minister had been more or less fully investigated. It is probable, therefore, that Sejanus counted on both Labeo and Sabinus to keep Moesia quiet. As to his arrangements in Dalmatia and Pannonia, lacking the names of the governors there⁴⁸ we are left in ignorance. The two legions in Dalmatia could easily reach Italy,⁴⁹ but, if they came alone, the praetorian guards and other troops at hand could probably deal with

A. von Domaszewski, in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, XLV. (1890) 1-5, who has, as it seems to me, practically proved that Labeo was subordinate to Sabinus, who controlled all three provinces. This view is also held by S. E. Stout, *The Governors of Moesia* (Princeton, 1911), pp. 2-6. Liebenam (p. 266, note 2) cites Tac., V. 10, to prove Labeo's independence. It is true that Tacitus says that Sabinus was governor of Macedonia with authority over Achaia, and that Moesia is not mentioned. But the context furnishes an obvious reason why Tacitus should speak of Achaia and none for referring to Moesia. Dio (LVIII. 25) says that Sabinus governed Moesia and Macedonia throughout almost the whole reign of Tiberius. For further discussion see the references above. In the case of Sabinus it seems clear that Sejanus tried to gain the support of a governor already in office, rather than to secure the appointment of a new legate. This was true not only of Sabinus but, perhaps, also of Labeo.

⁴⁵ Tac., XIII. 45; also Suetonius, *Nero*, 35.

⁴⁶ Tac., IV. 47.

⁴⁷ Tac., VI. 29. Dio, LVIII. 24, mentions only a charge of bribery against Labeo. If this were so then the letter of Tiberius to the senate would mean that the other charges were held in reserve but had not yet been made public. Dio, LVIII. 25, says further that Sabinus died before any charges could be brought against him, but Tacitus in his account of the death of Sabinus (VI. 39) gives no confirmation to this hint.

⁴⁸ Liebenam, *Die Legaten*, is somewhat confused. He names A. Plautius as governor of Dalmatia before 44, or of Pannonia about 30. The only authority he cites (p. 82) for making Plautius governor of either is an inscription in the *Corpus*, V., no. 698, which describes him as a legate of Claudius. I should be glad to put him in Pannonia about 30, but it seems to me impossible on the evidence.

⁴⁹ Tac., IV. 5.

them. It is unlikely, however, that Sejanus trusted to this. Doubtless he took steps to secure both armies, but we are unable to determine their nature.

The Rhine and Danube armies arranged for, there remained only the remoter provinces to consider. Those where troops were stationed were Africa with two legions, Spain with three, and Syria with four. It is true that Egypt had two legions, but, as the commander was a knight and the province was very isolated, it could cause no trouble. The others, however, must be dealt with. As Africa was one of the senate's provinces and its governor was chosen by lot from among the consulars, there was little chance for Sejanus to control it directly. Vibius Marsus was appointed in 27 and his term was extended to three years instead of the usual two. He was recalled in 30 and no successor is known till 33. During this interval some subordinate officer was left in charge.⁵⁰ Both Spain and Syria were imperial provinces and it might seem that Sejanus would install friends, but here as in Africa he worked indirectly. They were intrusted to men of consular rank as was customary, Spain to L. Arruntius and Syria to L. Aelius Lamia, but these governors were kept in Rome year after year and never went to their provinces at all. The detention of these men in Rome has given rise to some speculation. Suetonius ascribes it to the distrust of them felt by Tiberius.⁵¹ But it seems hard to understand why he should have appointed them if, at the time, he regarded them with suspicion. Tarver has sought to explain the matter by suggesting that the emperor intended to make the governors play the part of secretaries of state for their provinces, remaining in Rome and administering affairs through deputies as Suetonius says that those in question did.⁵² Of any such general design there is no hint in the sources and another explanation is possible. Spain and Syria must be governed by men of consular rank and such men were few in the party of Sejanus. Neither Lamia nor Arruntius was a man whom he could trust, but there would be no advantage in their dismissal unless he had friends to replace them. These were difficult to find since the candidates must be not only consulars, but men of tried ability, and, while friends of Sejanus, such men as the emperor would be willing to appoint. A way out of the difficulty was to persuade Tiberius to keep the two governors in Rome without dismissing them. While

⁵⁰ That is, of course, if the gap is not merely apparent and due to our ignorance of the name of the proconsul for 31-32.

⁵¹ Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 63.

⁵² J. C. Tarver, *Tiberius the Tyrant* (Westminster, 1902), p. 318.

they remained in the city their provinces were administered by men of lower rank whom it was easier to manipulate.⁵³

I am not inclined, however, to reject Tarver's suggestion entirely. Sejanus must induce the emperor to detain Arruntius and Lamia in Rome, yet he must find a pretext for not dismissing them at once. The plan which Tarver attributes to Tiberius may have been used by Sejanus for this purpose. He could propose such a scheme and advise its trial in certain provinces, thus gaining his end. The fact that a resident governor of Syria was appointed very soon after the favorite's fall ⁵⁴ makes it seem possible that the plan came from him rather than from Tiberius, and its application to these particular provinces would suit his interests very well. If the number of consulars on whom Sejanus could rely was small and those of them who were fit for high command was smaller still,⁵⁵ then the minister must place those few in the positions which were most vital to his success. Undoubtedly these were the provinces on the Rhine and Danube. We have seen clearly how he hoped to keep the armies on the Rhine quiet. One of the armies on the Danube he had secured, and probably he had gained the other two as well. If Tiberius died and he was proclaimed in Rome, it must have seemed that he would be accepted by the entire empire, but the indirect means employed to control the remoter provinces seem to show the weakness of his party among the higher aristocracy.

If the conclusions so far reached are accepted it is possible to understand to some extent the party strife in the reign of Tiberius and to regard the parties as, in a sense, the direct descendants of those of the republic. In the days of Cicero the two main factions were the *Populares* and the *Optimates*. These last were the supporters of the nobility while their rivals represented the opposition to the aristocracy. This opposition was recruited mainly from the lower classes and was led largely by discontented nobles, out of favor with the governing clique. It included the new men and lesser nobles, trying to force their way to the front, and to gain votes it put forward some more or less popular bills. With the establishment of the empire such bids for popular support became unneces-

⁵³ The date of Lamia's appointment is wholly doubtful (Liebenam, *Die Legaten*, pp. 371-372). The editors of the *Prosopographia* differ among themselves (compare the article on Aelius Lamia with that on Sentius Saturninus). Arruntius was appointed in 25 or 26, when Sejanus was very strong, and I would guess that Lamia's appointment was between 24 and 27.

⁵⁴ Pomponius Flaccus was appointed in 32. Tac., VI. 27, and Liebenam, *Die Legaten*.

⁵⁵ Mam. Scaurus, for example, was a friend but a man of bad character. Tac., VI. 29.

sary and were accordingly dropped. This left the *Populares* with nothing but opposition to that practical monopoly of office which the *Optimates* were striving to maintain. The real issue was thus simplified to this, should the empire be administered almost exclusively by the old aristocratic families, or should there be a career freely open to merit, with the rapid promotion of new men? As the emperor was in a position to control the solution of the problem, both sides sought zealously to secure his favor and support.

It was not until the accession of Tiberius that the strife became bitter. This may have been due in large part to the way in which the question of the imperial succession was dragged into it. It is clear that, although Augustus accepted Tiberius as his immediate successor, he intended Germanicus to follow Tiberius. To this arrangement there was one serious objection, namely, that Tiberius had a son of his own, and men must have asked themselves whether he would really carry out the wishes of Augustus to the disadvantage of this son. Many would certainly think it likely that, urged by natural affection, he could be induced to make Drusus his heir. Whatever the actual intentions of Tiberius, the situation was one which must have led men who for any reason disliked or feared Germanicus to dream of thrusting him aside in favor of Drusus. Now Tiberius leaned strongly toward the *Optimates* in his personal preferences, and this may have led the *Populares* to rally around Germanicus. The less they could hope for advancement from the emperor, the more they must look for it to the influence of the heir apparent. This was all the more natural as the prince was the champion of an aggressive frontier policy from which they might expect an opening for promotion.

If at first Tiberius showed marked favor to the *Optimates*, yet when he finally recalled Germanicus and checked the forward policy on the Rhine he thought it prudent to compensate the *Populares* with a large share of the highest offices. They still continued to support Germanicus, however, and the *Optimates* turned more and more to Drusus as their candidate for the succession. Thus the strife of parties in Rome grew more and more bitter until the death of Germanicus in the East imposed a truce. Drusus was now the inevitable heir and no party, whatever its real feelings, dared to quarrel with him. With Germanicus out of the way, Tiberius reverted to his former attitude, displaying his preference for the *Optimates* without reserve. This continued till the sudden death of Drusus again altered the situation and opened up the prospect of an emperor who might favor the other party. The *Populares* began to rally about

Agrippina, when a new factor made itself felt in the ambitions of Sejanus, at first unsuspected by Tiberius or the world. If the minister was to gain the crown he must secure a party to support him. This he could not hope to find in the Optimates, who would never acquiesce in the rule of a new man. He was, therefore, forced to turn to the Populares. They, however, were devoted to Agrippina and her sons. Still it did not seem impossible to win them over, since their chief desire was a friendly emperor and they might accept anyone, regardless of birth. By a mixture of fear and persuasion, by striking down some of the chief friends of Agrippina, and by distributing imperial favors he succeeded in breaking up her party and winning over many of its members.

Thus Sejanus was finally able to organize a party of his own in spite of these and other difficulties, among which were the natural inclinations of Tiberius in favor of the aristocracy and the fact that he was not prepared to advance Sejanus at the expense of the house of Caesar. However, the favorite was at last able to arouse the emperor's suspicion of Agrippina and her two oldest sons and so to procure their destruction. In the use of the imperial patronage he was forced to exercise caution since it was necessary to fill the most important places with his friends without provoking distrust. This would be easy if he had some supporters among the great nobles, such men as Tiberius would be ready to promote; but just here lay his weakness. This class might stoop to fawn upon him in public, but he knew well that he could not trust them. The crisis came about 30, when with the house of Germanicus removed from his path at last, he hoped for a marriage into the imperial family and his formal recognition by Tiberius as heir to the throne,⁵⁶ probably on the understanding that he should in turn be succeeded by Tiberius Gemellus, the emperor's own grandson. If this was not conceded peacefully, he may have planned to resort to violence. Whatever his precise intentions, his elevation was impossible without the consent of the armies. He believed that he had won over a handful of great nobles, few indeed, but enough to make success probable through the adroit manipulation of the provincial commands. Tiberius saw the situation clearly, if tardily, and realized that Sejanus must either be accepted as his colleague or destroyed at once. The emperor chose the latter alternative and contrived to overthrow the minister. This left Tiberius isolated, for the rise of Sejanus was resented by one party and his fall by the other. The emperor no longer dared trust either, and sought safety in terrorism and in a

⁵⁶ Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 65; Dio, LVIII. 3 (Zonar., XI. 2) and 9; Tac., V. 6 and VI. 8.

balancing of class against class.⁵⁷ As Pelham says,⁵⁸ he had tried faithfully to maintain the constitution of Augustus, but it had broken down and to save himself he was driven to rule rather as a despot than as a *princeps*. To this result, it seems to me, the party strife, envenomed by the uncertainty of the succession, may have contributed more than any vain republican dreams among the nobles or any sudden degeneracy in the senate.

Such a reading of the situation is, of course, more or less conjectural, but it seems to fit such facts as we know and to be, in itself, neither unreasonable nor improbable. If accepted it may throw some light on a difficult period in Roman history. Tacitus informs us that the reign of Tiberius exhibited three distinct phases: in the first he appeared a just and wise ruler, in the second there was a mixture of good and evil in his acts, while in the last he showed himself a tyrant pure and simple.⁵⁹ These changes Tacitus attributes to the gradual dropping of the mask behind which the emperor had at first hidden his real character. We may discover another explanation and find a key in the changes which took place in his position. If he sharpened the law of treason, it may have been from a desire to check the bitterness of party strife. The readiness with which he advanced Sejanus may not have arisen wholly from a blind confidence in his favorite, but also from a hope that the lesser nobility would be less dangerous if led by a man whom he believed loyal to himself than if under the control of Agrippina and her friends. In brief, if we construe the situation as it has been tentatively outlined above, we may be able to explain the tragedy of Tiberius without imputing to that emperor an incredible depravity. Neither need we, to save ourselves from such an imputation, accuse Tacitus and others of deliberate mendacity, or of such blind prejudice as rendered them incapable of seeing accurately the plainest facts. We have only to suppose that they failed to understand clearly a complex situation and construed it in purely personal terms, overlooking the underlying political factors.

FRANK BURR MARSH.

⁵⁷ This seems to appear from the character of the consuls from 32 to 37.

⁵⁸ H. F. Pelham, *Essays* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 34 ff.

⁵⁹ Compare Tac., IV. 6 and VI. 51.

THE EUROPEAN POWERS AND THE FRENCH OCCUPATION OF TUNIS, 1878-1881, II.

III.

It is neither possible nor necessary to enter here upon the story of the execution of the terms of the Treaty of Berlin. It will be remembered that almost every clause of the Balkan settlement caused endless difficulty and dangerous friction between the Great Powers. Russia was profoundly disappointed and disgusted with the results obtained and made no secret of her feelings. A good deal can no doubt be said for the ideals represented by the "Pan-slav" movement in Russia at this time, yet it would be difficult to defend the obstinate and sulky attitude of the Russian government towards the effectual execution of the terms it had accepted. The keen eye of Bismarck soon took in the situation, and as early as March, 1879, he spoke very pessimistically of the future to General Chanzy, who was passing through Berlin on his way to assume the position of French ambassador at St. Petersburg.¹ In the summer the situation became acute, when the Tsar wrote the now famous letter to his uncle, the Kaiser, in which he practically threatened reprisals if Germany continued to oppose the Russian claims. But Bismarck had still further grounds for apprehension. In September he learned, and from no less a person than Waddington himself, that Russia had in August sounded the Paris government in regard to a possible alliance, a suggestion which Waddington had declined to consider. According to further information received in Berlin, Russia had at the same time sounded the Italian government, which had shown itself much more receptive, and had refused the offer only after Beaconsfield had declared that its acceptance would mean war with England.²

¹ Daudet, *St. Vallier*, pp. 107-108. Cf. also Cecil, *Salisbury*, II. 362, and Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 194, reflecting Bismarck's apprehensions in May and June, 1879, that is, some time before the "Briefohrfeige".

² On this important episode, first revealed by Fleischer (*Deutsche Revue*, Feb., 1880, p. 251, and the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Apr. 7, 1880) and by Baron von Varnbüler in a speech at Ludwigsburg on Sept. 5, 1880, and denied by Waddington in the *Argus Soissonais* on Sept. 15, 1880, and *Matin*, Nov. 7, 1888, see especially Chaudordy, *La France en 1889*, pp. 262, 269-277; Galli, *Des-sous Diplomatiques*, p. 160, note; Hohenlohe, II. 275; Eckardt, *Lebenserinnerungen*, II. 38 ff.; Marcks, *Erinnerungen an Bismarck*, p. 312; *Aus dem Leben König Karls von Rumänien*, IV. 248; Wertheimer, *Andrássy*, III. 258, 279; Pribram, *Geheimverträge*, I. 132; Lucius, *Bismarck-Erinnerungen*, pp. 176-177; Cecil,

These developments were more than enough to decide Bismarck. The nightmare of coalitions was upon him,³ and he bent his entire energy to forestalling the realization of his fears. The first step was to secure Austria and this he succeeded in doing, in spite of the persistent opposition of the Kaiser, by the Austro-German Alliance of October 7, 1879. But this was not enough. At the height of the crisis Bismarck suggested an alliance with England, but he gave up this idea when he discovered the lukewarmness of Salisbury and when the negotiations for the Austrian treaty took a favorable turn.⁴ There remained France, but it soon appeared that there was no cause for uneasiness in that quarter. Waddington spared no pains in reassuring Bismarck as to France's attitude and repeated these assurances to Salisbury in a conference which took place at Puy on September 19.⁵ Waddington could evidently be relied upon, though he was uneasy enough about the new pact between the central powers. Realizing this Bismarck went out of his way to give adequate explanations to Teisserenc de Bort, the French ambassador in Vienna, and assurances to St. Vallier, who was invited to Varzin for that very purpose on November 14.⁶

So far as the Tunis question is concerned the events of August and September, 1879, only served to strengthen Bismarck in his policy. Nothing could have been more gratifying to him than the stand taken by Waddington, and he was no doubt sincere when he told St. Vallier that he desired good relations between England and France and close co-operation of those two powers with Germany and Austria in holding in check the two dissatisfied nations, Russia and Italy.⁷ With the latter Bismarck was never more thoroughly

Salisbury, II. 364; Busch, *Bismarck*, etc., III. 289-290. Rachfahl (*Deutschland und die Weltpolitik*, I. 260) says Russia had already sounded Italy in the spring of 1879. On Jan. 30, 1879, Petrucelli had advocated an Italian-Russian alliance in the chamber (*Politica Estera Italiana*, pp. 167-168). On the whole matter see, finally, *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 54, 81-82, 88, 93, 136, 141.

³ Lucius, p. 174 (Sept. 28, 1879).

⁴ Monypenny and Buckle, *Disraeli*, VI. 486 ff.; Cecil, *Salisbury*, II. 364-369; *Die Grosse Politik*, IV. 1-14; Fester, in *Deutsche Rundschau*, June, 1923; Rothfels, *Bismarcks Englische Bündnispolitik*, pp. 44 ff.

⁵ Cecil, *Salisbury*, II. 364; Daudet, *St. Vallier*, p. 171.

⁶ Daudet, *St. Vallier*, pp. 158-168; Hanotaux, IV. 501; Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 194-195; Andrassy and Haymerle also gave the French ambassador the most positive assurances. On St. Vallier's visit to Varzin, see St. Vallier's report in Chaudordy, pp. 253-268, in Daudet, pp. 171-172, and in Bourgeois and Pagès, pp. 195-196.

⁷ Chaudordy, p. 167. That Bismarck was sincere appears from his utterances to Hohenlohe (*Denkwürdigkeiten*, II. 280). Indeed the Emperor told Hohenlohe that it seemed to him that Bismarck was working for a coalition of Germany, Austria, England, and France against Russia (*ibid.*, II. 277; Lucius, p. 175).

out of sympathy. He was enraged not only by Italy's flirtations with Russia, but also by the Italian government's leniency towards the irredentist movement, which reached its highest pitch after Cairoli's return to power in June, 1879. Already at that time he had warned the Italians that Germany would never allow them to lay hands on the Trentino, Istria, or Trieste,⁸ but his warnings had fallen on deaf ears and after the episode of August, 1879, he lost patience completely. Count Robilant was the only ambassador on whom he did not call in Vienna in September, 1879, and when Andrassy asked if he had any objections to Austria's reconquering the lost provinces in Italy he said: "No, Italy is not one of our friends." He is also said to have told the papal nuncio in Vienna that he would not oppose the restoration of the temporal power.⁹ In February, 1880, he called upon the Austrian government to take a firmer stand and threaten the shameless Italians, whom he compared to jackals and to crows devouring carcasses on the battlefield.¹⁰

Indeed, it would be difficult to find an adequate explanation for the short-sighted, headstrong policy of Cairoli at this time. Italian writers are pretty well agreed that, patriot though he was, Cairoli was entirely unfitted for his position and that he constantly allowed his feelings and desires to gain the mastery over common-sense.¹¹ By September, 1879, Italy was fully as isolated as she had been at the Congress of Berlin. England and Germany had been estranged by the pro-Russian leanings of the Italian government, while Austria, and indirectly Germany, were outraged by Cairoli's leniency towards

⁸ So he told St. Vallier (Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 370). Grabinski, *Depretis*, p. 270, says the Italian ministers never believed in the possibility of an Austro-German alliance, that on the contrary they persisted in thinking that Bismarck was merely awaiting his chance to annex the German provinces of Austria.

⁹ Cappelli, in *Nuova Antologia*, Nov. 1, 1897, p. 4; Cappelli, in *Neue Freie Presse*, Aug. 3, 1906. Cf. also Chiala, II. 41-44.

¹⁰ Busch, *Bismarck*, etc., III. 233, 289-290, where he prints a letter of Bismarck to Reuss of Jan. 28, 1880. See, further, Lucius, p. 176, and especially Pribram, I. 130-131, and Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 199, where Bismarck remarks to St. Vallier, "Ces Italiens, l'appétit leur est venu avant les dents", and on another occasion, "Ces Italiens, ils ont un si gros appétit et de si mauvaises dents". Hanotaux (IV. 644) takes Bismarck's suggestions to Austria seriously. In the spring of 1880 the Austrian government began to mass troops in the Tyrol (Crispi, p. 81; Chiala, II. 49-50).

¹¹ "Le nouveau chef du pouvoir avait toutes les qualités négatives requises pour l'éloigner du poste qu'il occupait" (Grabinski, *Depretis*, p. 253, speaking of Cairoli). "Tutta la politica del ministero Cairoli era improntata ad una certa bonaria ingenuità, suggerita al Presidente del Consiglio dal suo pertinace idealismo" (Gallavresi, *Italia e Austria*, p. 136). "Cairoli scamiava perpetuamente le affatto subbiettive induzioni dei subbiettivi dati del suo cervello con i fatti e le ragioni dei fatti" (Torre, in Curatulo, p. 109). For similar estimates, see Plehn, p. 29, and Coolidge, p. 205.

the irredentist agitation, which, after all, had no chance of success. And yet, isolated though Italy was, Cairoli resumed his policy of advance in Tunis, though he had every reason to suppose that, to all intents and purposes, the question had been settled internationally in favor of France. "England is giving France a free hand in Tunis", declared Damiani in the chamber on July 21, 1879, adding rather incongruously that "Tunis is the last door open to Italy".¹² Cairoli ignored the former statement but acted on the second. The timely warnings of the ambassador in Paris were put aside, and Cairoli went on his way undeterred. About all that can be said in his favor is that he was no worse than a number of the deputies and newspaper editors, who insisted that the Italian government do something to consolidate its position in Tunis.¹³

The year 1880 was decisive for the fate of Tunis, and was marked by a whole series of Franco-Italian conflicts. To mention the most serious of these will suffice to illustrate the character of all. The so-called Rubattino affair arose from the sale of the concession for a railway from Tunis to Goletta obtained by the English in 1871. It was natural that the French should be anxious to acquire the property in order to connect their Bône-Guelma line with the port of Tunis. But the French company found itself face to face with the active competition of Signor Rubattino, the owner of the Italian steamship line plying between Palermo and Goletta. Only by paying an exorbitant price did the French finally secure the line (April 14, 1880). The matter might have rested there, had not the Italian bidder, encouraged and supported by promises of help from the government, succeeded in finding a flaw in the transaction. An English law required that no English railroad in the Orient should be sold without the consent of the court. This the French had overlooked and so, on June 16, the High Court in London pronounced the sale void. New bids were taken and on July 7 Rubattino obtained the property for a staggering figure representing several times the value. Shortly after the Italian parliament passed a bill guaranteeing Rubattino the interest on the price and an annual subvention

¹² Chiala, II. 125-126.

¹³ Cialdini believed that the French would do nothing for the present unless provoked by the Italians. On the other hand, he was convinced that if so provoked the French would no longer stand by the declarations they had given in 1878 (see especially Torre, reprinted in Curatulo, pp. 98-99, whose article was based largely on Cialdini's correspondence). On the pressure of public opinion in Italy, see Chiala, II. 170, and especially the excerpts from the debates in the Italian parliament on pp. 172-178. It appears that Menabrea, the Italian ambassador in London, supported Cairoli and led him to suppose that the English favored the Italians.

of 600,000 francs. In this manner the hand of the Italian government was disclosed, although before the adjudication an agreement had been made with the French government not to interfere.¹⁴

There can be little doubt that it was the Rubattino incident that decided the French to act. Cairoli had, some months before, declared in the Italian parliament that Italy had political as well as economic obligations in Tunis, and the intervention of the government in the matter of the railway was a significant commentary on his utterances. It was high time for the French to abandon the defensive and adopt a more vigorous policy.¹⁵ Bismarck was enthusiastically behind the French government in anything it might choose to undertake and was giving the French claims undivided support at the Madrid Conference on the affairs of Morocco.¹⁶ The outcome of the Rubattino incident was a sharp exchange of notes between Paris and Rome, in which Freycinet, French foreign minister since 1879, asserted the desire of the French government for the maintenance of the *status quo*, but absolutely rejected the Italian suggestions for an equal division of influence or for compensation in case the *status quo* were changed in favor of France.¹⁷

The French would almost certainly have gone ahead in the summer of 1880 had it not been for the recent cabinet change in England. There was no way of knowing whether the new Gladstone ministry, in which Granville was foreign minister, would accept the informal engagements made by its predecessor, and there was real uneasiness lest the rather Russophil, anti-Austrian tendencies of the new premier would soon lead to the end of good Anglo-

¹⁴ On the Rubattino affair see Constant, pp. 93-95; Chiala, II. 178 ff.; Broadley, I. 186-189.

¹⁵ For Cairoli's declarations in Parliament, see Chiala, II. 176-178. Crispi, in an interview published in the *Figaro* on Sept. 29, 1890, recognized the position of the French and condemned Cairoli's policy in the matter, although Rubattino was his brother-in-law. The *Perseveranza* uttered one warning after the other, and on July 13, 1880, wrote: "L'aggiudicazione . . . è un fatto che in tutti gli uomini preveggenti deve destar più preoccupazioni che soddisfazioni" (see Chiala, II. 192-193, 219-220). Cialdini at the time condemned the Italian policy as "un enorme errore politico", and the French foreign minister in 1881 told him, "La faccenda della ferrovia Rubattino fu un guanto di sfida che la Francia non poteva fare a meno di raccogliere" (Torre, in Curatulo, pp. 99, 119).

¹⁶ Daudet, p. 196; Hohenlohe, II. 291; *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 395-398. According to Bourgeois and Pagès (p. 201), Bismarck let Freycinet know early in June that he would continue to support French policy in the Mediterranean.

¹⁷ Freycinet to Noailles, May 20, July 12, July 16, 1880; Noailles to Freycinet, July 25, 1880 (Lebon, pp. 409, 413-419, reprint in Chiala, II. 194-205). Freycinet told Cialdini that in any case France would not change the existing "état de possession territoriale" without notifying Italy beforehand. Cf. also Cialdini's letter of July 9 (Torre, in Curatulo, p. 100).

German relations, which practically constituted a *sine qua non* for French action.¹⁸ In June the French government made inquiries in London as to the future attitude of the new ministry, and the reply received was by no means encouraging. Granville made no attempt to conceal his displeasure, though he accepted the obligations entered upon by his predecessor.¹⁹ The result was that the French suspended action, for the time being, though repeated warnings were given to Italy and some attempt was made to direct the latter to Tripoli. Freycinet made no promise not to act and confined himself to reiterating: "The future is in God's hands."²⁰ In the meanwhile Roustan was instructed to open negotiations with the Bey for the acceptance by the latter of a formal protectorate. "Authorize me to debark a company of marines and the Bey will sign", Roustan finally wrote. According to Freycinet he was about to give the order when, in September, his ministry fell and was succeeded by the first Ferry cabinet, in which Barthélemy St. Hilaire was foreign minister.²¹

IV.

In the history of the second French colonial empire the name of Ferry looms far above that of Waddington or Freycinet, but at this time the new premier was absorbed by questions of home policy and his foreign minister was rather of the timid type. Freycinet had attempted to convince the new prime minister and had repeated to him the words used somewhat earlier by Bismarck: "The fruit is ripe; you will pick it at the propitious moment."²² But the suggestion was ignored. President Grévy had been opposed from the beginning and even Gambetta, who seems to have been temporarily convinced by Freycinet, was evidently impressed by Cialdini's hints that the occupation of Tunis by the French would lead to a new orientation of Italian policy.²³

¹⁸ For Bismarck's uneasiness, see St. Vallier to Freycinet, Apr. 7, 1880 (Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 200). Gladstone had given vent to his Austrophobe feelings in a speech made in March, which later caused the new ministry considerable embarrassment (Fitzmaurice, *Life of Lord Granville*, II. 200).

¹⁹ Granville to Lyons, June 17, 1880 (*State Papers*, LXXIII. 441). Cf. also Lebon, p. 410. Granville loyally discouraged Italian feelers for an entente to check France. See Crispi, p. 89; Torre, in Curatulo, pp. 108-109.

²⁰ Lebon, pp. 415-418; Crispi, pp. 85-86; Torre, in Curatulo, p. 102.

²¹ Freycinet, *Souvenirs*, p. 168. Cf. Constant, p. 172, note. As a matter of fact three French warships arrived off Tunis, and Cialdini certainly expected that the French would delay no longer (Torre, in Curatulo, p. 103).

²² Freycinet, p. 168.

²³ It was at this time that Grévy made the famous remark that Tunis was not worth the price of a ten-centime cigar. Crispi, p. 84; Torre, in Curatulo, p. 112; Chiala, II. 230-231; and Valet, *L'Afrique du Nord devant le Parlement au XIX^e*

For a few months the Tunisian question once more disappeared from the arena of European politics. Cialdini, realizing that the forward policy of Cairoli would force the French to action, had counselled an alliance with the central powers and at a conference with Cairoli on August 26 had at least partially convinced the incredulous Italian premier. Unofficial attempts were made early in September to open negotiations with the central powers, but Cairoli dropped the idea when Bismarck rather gruffly pointed out that the road to Berlin passed through Vienna.²⁴ The German chancellor was still behind the French and could not see why the Eastern crisis could not be solved by the English taking Egypt while the French received Syria and Tunis.²⁵ As for the Italians, it had been decided by Cialdini and Cairoli that for the present a policy of the "utmost coldness and indifference" should be followed towards France, to give the impression that Italy was in a position to await developments.²⁶

The calm was once more broken by the impetuosity of Cairoli. It may be that the dissatisfaction of the deputies was responsible in large part for his determination to resume the aggressive.²⁷ At any rate, early in November he instructed Cialdini to open negotiations with the French in regard to a concession for a telegraph line from Sicily to Tunis. Cialdini protested vehemently against this new turn and pointed out that Freycinet, Gambetta, and the whole ministry had declared against such a concession on a previous occasion. Furthermore he called attention to the fact that by reopening the question the Italians were practically admitting to the French that the attempted *rapprochement* with the central powers had failed. But Cairoli insisted, and adduced arguments which he felt must convince the French of the Italian case.²⁸

Siècle, p. 177, where the attitude of Ferry and St. Hilaire is also discussed. On Gambetta's view and on Cialdini's hints as to the possibility of Italy's pursuing a new policy, see Torre (in Curàtulo, pp. 98-99, and especially pp. 104-105).

²⁴ Chiala's account (II. 222-224) is seriously called in question by Torre (in Curàtulo, pp. 101, 104), who used Cialdini's correspondence. As a matter of fact Chiala's own story is in conflict with a letter of Cialdini's which he prints on page 188. For the advances made to Germany by Italy, see Chiala, II. 222-224; Crispi, pp. 95-98; and especially *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 183, note.

²⁵ Odo Russell to Granville, Jan. 26, 1881, referring to a conversation he had had with Bismarck the previous October. Fitzmaurice, *Lord Granville*, II. 225.

²⁶ Torre, in Curàtulo, p. 105.

²⁷ Certainly the debates which took place in the Italian Chamber in November, 1880, would indicate this as the explanation. For an extract of the debates, see Chiala, II. 232 ff.

²⁸ Torre, in Curàtulo, p. 107. Cialdini's reply is particularly interesting: "En tout cela", he wrote Cairoli on Nov. 16, "il ne s'agit de bonnes raisons, ni d'argumentations adroites et subtiles. Il s'agit tout bonnement d'un programme

The incident had been enough to alarm the French once more. What Cialdini had foretold now took place. Late in November St. Vallier was again at Friedrichsruh, where he attempted to enlist Bismarck's support in holding the Italians in check. He maintained that the government at Rome was planning to depose the Bey and install the Tunisian prime minister in his stead. Against such action, said St. Vallier, the French government would feel compelled to take extreme measures. Bismarck enthusiastically promised the French every kind of support, short of military aid, and agreed to warn the Italians not only that they must not rely on Germany, but that he (Bismarck) entirely disapproved of their attitude and had expressed to the French his sympathy with the French policy.²⁹

Even with the assurances of Bismarck's support the French still hesitated. Evidently there was still a considerable difference of opinion as to what should be done. The men on the spot, in Tunis and Algeria, favored immediate action, but Grévy as well as Ferry and St. Hilaire seem to have continued in opposition.³⁰ Gambetta, too, appears to have thought that an arrangement could still be made with the Italians, and sent his friend, M. de Billing, a former diplomat and acquaintance of the Bey, to Tunis by way of Rome, to see if the whole matter could not be "chloroformed".³¹ An old suggestion of Cialdini's, that both countries should replace their rather aggressive consuls, was taken up again. This solution was actually decided on by de Billing in Rome, but even then the wind had turned.³² Italian indiscretion had finally convinced even the more reluctant French statesmen.

politique que la France a adopté et dont elle ne s'écartera pas. L'influence française, chassée d'Europe par le Prince de Bismarck, est rabattue sur l'Afrique, où elle ne craint pas de s'heurter contre l'Allemagne."

²⁹ Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 203; Hohenlohe, II. 306-307. Perhaps also Bismarck's remark to Cohen on Oct. 11, 1884 (Brauer, *Marcks Müller: Erinnerungen an Bismarck*, p. 324), refers to this visit rather than to the earlier one. Cohen quotes: "Die erste Annäherung an Frankreich seit dem Kriege datiere von der Affäre in Tunis, die er in Friedrichsruh mit St. Vallier auf einer Fahrt im Walde abgemacht habe."

³⁰ Barthélemy de St. Hilaire, in *Fragments pour l'Histoire de la Diplomatie Française du 23 Septembre 1880 au 14 Novembre 1881* (Paris, Chamerot, 1882, 448 pp.), no doubt throws much light on French policy. Unfortunately the book was never placed on the market and no writer seems to have been able to consult it.

³¹ Chiala, II. 262-263; Constant, pp. 108-110; Hanotaux, IV. 646. The mission itself is described by Billing in *Le Baron Robert de Billing, Vie, Notes, Correspondance* (Paris, 1895), published by his widow. The main parts are reprinted by Chiala, in an appendix.

³² Cialdini made the suggestion in Sept., 1880 (Chiala, II. 228 ff.). De Billing came to an agreement with Count Maffei, the Italian under-secretary, and Maccio's recall was actually announced in the *Diritto* on Jan. 24, 1881 (Chiala, II. 264-265; de Billing in Chiala, appendix).

On January 10, 1881, Maccio, accompanied by the Bey's brother and by a delegation of Italians resident in Tunis, appeared at Palermo to greet King Humbert. Maccio made a high-sounding address, and the Italian newspapers did not hesitate to point out the political significance of the incident.³³ Shortly after, Maccio, on his return to Tunis, attempted to interfere with the construction of the French railroad from Tunis to Susa by digging up an old concession granted to an Italian, which had long since lapsed.³⁴

The "noisy" demonstrations at Palermo had an electrifying effect in Paris. Already in Rome de Billing learned that Gambetta had changed his mind,³⁵ and when he reached Tunis he pursued a policy quite different from the one agreed upon in Paris. His object was to secure the French position by peaceful means if possible, and to that end he sought out his friend the Bey and induced him to agree to sign a treaty, in return for which the French were to recall the troublesome Roustan. There appears to have been a good deal of friction between de Billing and Roustan, and some delay in getting de Billing's report to Paris. What was the reply we do not know, but it appears that Roustan, unaware of the steps de Billing had taken, tried his own hand at securing a treaty, and the whole thing fell flat.³⁶

The French still delayed for a time. What the reasons for this hesitancy were is not wholly clear. It may be that, since a peaceful settlement with the Bey had been frustrated, the French ministers could not yet make up their minds to take military action. It may also be that they got wind of new negotiations between the Italian and Austrian governments. And finally they may have been deterred by a rather sharp conflict with the English regarding the claims of a certain English citizen in Tunis.³⁷ But the English, in spite of

³³ Chiala, II. 255-259; Lebon, pp. 422 ff.; Broadley, I. 194; Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 110.

³⁴ Broadley, I. 202-203.

³⁵ According to Hanotaux, IV. 646, Baron de Courcel, of the French Foreign Office, was largely responsible for the final conversion of Gambetta. Valet, *L'Afrique du Nord devant le Parlement au XIX^e Siècle* (1924), on page 176, note, quotes a story which he says is an explanation for French action well known at Tunis. According to this bit of scandal the mistress of Signor Maccio had an affair with a member of Roustan's staff and told him that the Italians were preparing an expedition.

³⁶ See especially de Billing's account in Chiala, appendix. On Roustan's activities, consult Chiala, II. 268-270; Broadley, I. 197-198; Freycinet, pp. 168-169; and Maccio's despatch of Feb. 1, 1881 (Crispi, pp. 86-87). Barrère also wrote Dilke that the Bey "declines to sign a treaty of alliance with us" (Gwynn and Tuckwell, I. 380).

³⁷ According to General Cosseron de Villenoisy (*Avenir Militaire*, Mar. 3, 1893, quoted by Chiala, II. 358-360) Ferry and St. Hilaire were opposed to mili-

the pointed remarks in the press, decided to yield on the so-called Enfida claims,³⁸ the French newspapers called loudly for action,³⁹ the coming elections seemed to make a success for the government very desirable,⁴⁰ and the French residents in Tunis presented through Roustan a petition calling on the French government to protect their interests in the Regency.⁴¹ The assassination of Alexander II. of Russia temporarily raised fears of a new Three Emperors' League directed against the Western powers, but evidently Bismarck again hastened to assure the French that there was no cause for apprehension.⁴²

By the middle of March the French government was ready to act. All that was needed was a pretext for a military expedition. This was found in the famous Krumir raid of March 30, 1881, which was particularly suitable because it gave an opportunity to settle with the Bey rather than with the claims of a foreign power. Not even the French writers now maintain that the Krumir raid was sufficient justification for the steps taken. These border raids were so frequent that every year the claims and counter-claims of the French government of Algiers and the Bey's government were settled in consultation. As recently as January, 1881, a similar outbreak had been amicably settled by negotiation.⁴³ In short, the action taken

tary measures to the very end. Cialdini also reported in February that the French desired a protectorate, not occupation or annexation (Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 112). On the negotiations between Italy and Austria see Crispi, pp. 95-99; Pribram, I. 133-134; Gallavresi, pp. 152-153. On the Enfida case see Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 238-239; Broadley, I. 198; Gwynn and Tuckwell, I. 379-380.

³⁸ So Lyons told Cialdini on Feb. 17 (Torre, in *Curatulo*, pp. 108-109).

³⁹ Chiala, II. 260-261; Cialdini's report of Feb. 17, 1881 (Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 112).

⁴⁰ Cialdini's letter of Feb. 17 (Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 112).

⁴¹ Chiala, II. 282-284. No doubt the petition was engineered by Roustan, who had from the beginning, favored vigorous intervention.

⁴² On fears of a Three Emperors' League see Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 237; Daudet, *St. Vallier*, pp. 246-249. On Feb. 1, 1881, Dilke had informed Gambetta that the Three Emperors' League had been revived and that France was once more isolated (Gwynn and Tuckwell, I. 379). There is no direct evidence that the French again consulted Bismarck, but it certainly seems so. Consult Constant, p. 124; and especially the remark of St. Hilaire (Chiala, II. 306-307); also Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 119.

⁴³ Constant, pp. 108-109; Broadley, I. 197; Chiala, II. 260, 264. Constant (p. 115) still takes the raid seriously, but on page 109 himself quotes the French *Yellow Book* to the effect that there had been 2379 similar raids between 1870 and 1881. De Billing (in Chiala, appendix) says the French troops, when they invaded, found no Krumirs, for the reason that the tribesmen had taken service with the French for five francs a day. Cf. further Broadley, I. 203, 263 ff.; the utterance of Baron de Ring, French consul in Cairo (*Nouvelle Revue*, Jan. 15, 1894): "Si les Français sont allés en Tunisie, cela n'a pas été pour refréner la turbulence d'une poignée de Kroumirs—cette fable a fait son temps—mais pour

against the frontier tribe was nothing more than the introduction to an expedition designed to force the Bey by military pressure to accept the French terms.

It was on March 31 that news of the outbreak of hostilities on the Tunisian-Algerian frontier reached the capitals of Europe.⁴⁴ On April 4 the French government announced in the Chamber that action would be taken and on April 7 credits were voted practically unanimously. From this time on despatches followed each other in quick succession between the various foreign offices. St. Hilaire, indeed, repeatedly assured the Italian ambassador that no military occupation or annexation was intended, but he carefully avoided the mention of a protectorate and stated that France would be compelled to regulate her conduct by the events. Cairoli refrained from mentioning these warnings in the Italian Chamber and gave the erroneous impression that the French were not contemplating serious action.⁴⁵ Evidently he still hoped that he could enlist the aid of the English, and Granville was, in fact, sorely tempted to accept the suggestions for joint action made by the Italians.⁴⁶ He had never liked the idea of a French protectorate and had only grudgingly accepted the obligations undertaken by his predecessor at Berlin. He resurrected the old fiction of Turkish sovereignty and began to insist that France secure the consent of the Porte. It is not unlikely that, without the interference of Gladstone, he might have allowed himself to be drawn into open opposition to France.⁴⁷

empêcher nos voisins italiens de s'y installer." Henri Rochefort, in *L'Intransigeant*, Apr. 25, 1881: "Le Cabinet Ferry offrirait 30,000 francs à qui lui procurerait un Kroumir pour le montrer à l'armée." Seignobos, in volume VIII. of the great *Histoire de la France Contemporaine* (pp. 343-344), twice speaks of the raid as a pretext, and the expedition against the Krumirs as "dissimulation".

⁴⁴ Hanotaux, IV. 651. According to Chiala, II. 289, the news reached Rome only on Apr. 3. This seems hardly credible.

⁴⁵ For Cialdini's correspondence and the misrepresentations of Cairoli, see Torre, in *Curatulo*, pp. 113-117.

⁴⁶ Granville to Lyons, Apr. 5, 1881 (Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 241). According to Gwynn and Tuckwell, I. 380, Granville actually drafted a despatch to Germany and Austria in an attempt to raise the concert of Europe "against France". Dilke persuaded him not to send it. Russia also offered to join England and Italy. Hanotaux, IV. 655, says that Dilke had been confidentially notified of the French intentions beforehand. Cairoli's hopes of English aid were based on the fact that he had loyally supported the English in the Dulcigno and Smyrna demonstrations, and on the attitude of the English press during the Enfida conflict with France. As a matter of fact he had, however, been frequently warned that England would give the French a free hand. Torre, in *Curatulo*, pp. 108-109, 114; Chiala, II. 273-281.

⁴⁷ Constant, pp. 126-127; Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 241-242; Fitzmaurice, *Lord Granville*, II. 234-235; Elliot, *Life of Goschen*, I. 237-239.

The French evidently realized the danger of joint opposition from Italy and England, and left no stone unturned to prevent such a development. There can be little doubt that Blowitz received the text of the Salisbury-Waddington negotiations of 1878 directly from the Quai d'Orsay.⁴⁸ At any rate the publication of these documents in the London *Times* on April 11 was a stroke of good luck for the French, for it crushed the opposition in England rather effectively and reassured the French voters. There was little to fear from Italy so long as England stood aloof and Bismarck remained loyal. On April 8 the German chancellor encouraged St. Vallier once more, and told General Pittié, who was passing through Berlin, to go ahead and not bother about the Italians.⁴⁹

Under the circumstances the French were quite safe from outside interference. The Italians raged and attempted again and again to enlist the support not only of England and the Porte, but even of Austria and Germany.⁵⁰ Everywhere their appeals were fruitless. Granville chafed, but finally contented himself by proposing mediation which he knew would be rejected, after which he extracted from the French government promises in regard to Bizerta and Tripoli.⁵¹ As for the Bey, he hoped till the last that Italy, England, and the Sultan would come to the rescue.⁵² The Porte, indeed, was all too ready, and would have sent a squadron to Tunis had it not been for the vigorous threats of the French and for the sharp words of warning that emanated from Berlin in reply to calls for help.⁵³ In every quarter could be felt the strong hand of Bismarck, who practically cut short all schemes of intervention.

No one appreciated this more deeply than the French, and there was no doubt a good measure of sincerity in the words of thanks addressed to Bismarck by St. Hilaire after the French "military

⁴⁸ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 241; Chiala, II. 322-323; Hanotaux, IV. 655.

⁴⁹ Hohenlohe, II. 310. According to Hippeau, *Histoire Diplomatique de la Troisième République*, p. 617, Bismarck said, speaking of Italy: "C'est une p. . . qui fait le trottoir." In the Council, on April 13, Bismarck said that the press was to be very reserved in what it said about Tunis. "Auf Italien habe man bei seiner Doppelzüngigkeit und Unzuverlässigkeit gar nicht zu rücksichtigen", he added (Lucius, p. 207).

⁵⁰ On these negotiations see the English *Blue Book* and the French *Yellow Book*; also Constant, p. 126; Chiala, II. 326-342.

⁵¹ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 251-252; Fitzmaurice, *Lord Granville*, II. 236.

⁵² He also appealed to Germany and Austria. The latter did not even reply. Chiala, II. 341-342.

⁵³ Constant, pp. 124-128; Daudet, pp. 210-217; Hanotaux, IV. 654 ff. Bismarck is there said to have used his moderating influence on England and Turkey, and even on Italy.

promenade" in Tunis was over, and the Bey had set his signature to the treaty of May 12.⁵⁴

Two factors proved decisive in bringing about the French occupation of Tunis. The first was the attitude of Bismarck, who, from the time of Waddington's ministry at the Quai d'Orsay, never wavered in his support of the French and, indeed, never allowed the opportunity to slip for urging the French to take drastic action. It was largely through his influence that the English were induced to leave France a free hand, and it was largely through his activity that the English were held to their original attitude. It seems safe to say that only Bismarck's firm stand prevented the formation of a coalition against France in April and May, 1881. The obvious explanation for his astonishing policy, and the one which has been generally accepted, is that he intended from the beginning to bring about an estrangement between Italy and France, and to drive Italy into an alliance with the central powers, thus completing the isolation of France.⁵⁵

No doubt these considerations were in Bismarck's mind, and it may also have been that he expected the French action to lead to an estrangement between England and France as well.⁵⁶ But the evidence would seem to indicate that his immediate object was quite different. The coalition which Bismarck feared most of all in these years was not one between France and Italy or even between France and England, but between France and Russia. The most effective way of preventing this was to occupy the French elsewhere and divert their attention from the "hole in the Vosges."⁵⁷ The sup-

⁵⁴ *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 399-401. St. Hilaire thanked Bismarck on May 26 and again on July 23.

⁵⁵ Cf. De Launay's report of Apr. 18, 1881 (Chiala, II. 326). Similarly Rochefort in the *Intransigeant*, May 13, 1881, and Mme. Adam in the *Nouvelle Revue*, June 1, 1881 (quoted by Chiala, II. 364-365). Bismarck did actually reflect on these possibilities at the time (see Lucius, p. 212, and Busch, *Bismarck, some Secret Pages of his History*, II. 475), and this interpretation evidently became traditional in the German Foreign Office after 1882 (cf. Kiderlen to Eulenburg, Apr. 16, 1890, in *Die Grosse Politik*, VII. 268, where the Tunisian affair is spoken of as "eines der letzten Meisterstücke von seiner Durchlaucht. . . . Italien fiel uns als reife Frucht in den Schoss").

⁵⁶ It was generally supposed that England would seek to strengthen her position in Egypt or elsewhere (see de Billing in Chiala, appendix). Cf. also von Hagen, in *Deutsche Revue*, 1912 (I.), pp. 118-119. Bourgeois and Pagès (p. 193, note 1) doubt such evil designs on Bismarck's part.

⁵⁷ In addition to what has already been said on this point cf. Busch, *Unser Reichskanzler*, II. 122, reporting a conversation with Bismarck in April, 1881. Bismarck said: "Es ist lächerlich, wenn man in der Haltung Deutschlands gegenüber der tunesischen Frage geheime Beweggründe und Hintergedanken

port of the French in Tunis was but the first step in a new policy the object of which was to compensate France for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine by the acquisition of colonies, and it must be remembered that the so-called "entente" thus established continued to function until 1885. To be sure, the French never accepted German friendship without reservations, and Bismarck never succeeded in making them forget Sedan as they had forgotten Waterloo.⁵⁸ But there is no reason to suppose that Bismarck ever entertained such illusions. His object was to divert the French during the critical period of the Eastern crisis and that immediately following, and in this he succeeded. Incidentally he did manage to drive a wedge between France and Italy and thus to obtain his secondary object. But in the years preceding 1885 he certainly laid more stress on the friendship with France, and it was only with the renewal of the Triple Alliance in 1887 that the Italians were able to derive any real advantage from it.

But even with Bismarck's support it seems unlikely that the French would have proceeded to occupy Tunis. The really decisive factor was, after all, the policy of Cairoli, though this, in turn, was largely conditioned by the arrangements made between France and England, under German auspices, at Berlin. Enough has already been said of Cairoli's attitude to make a summary superfluous here. But it is one of the paradoxes of history that the Italian patriot who was one of the firmest advocates of close relations to France, and one of the most inexorable enemies of Austria, should have become

entdecken will. Ich wundere mich aber darüber nicht; gerade deswegen, weil die Politik Deutschlands in dieser Angelegenheit so offenkundig durch die Natur der Dinge geboten ist, suchen die, welche politische Enten ausbrüten wollen und mit nationalen Idiosynkrasien Handel treiben, eifrig nach argen Hintergedanken. Die sogenannte tunesische Frage ist bis jetzt eine rein französische Angelegenheit. . . . Auch für Deutschland sind die Erfolge der Regierung der französischen Republik auf diesem und ähnlichen Gebieten in dem Masse ein Vorteil, als sie dazu beitragen, Frankreich zufrieden zu machen. Die Aufrechterhaltung des Friedens wird nie besser gewährleistet werden als durch Befriedigtsein derjenigen, welche unsre Gegner waren aus Gründen, die der Vergangenheit angehören und mit der Gegenwart nichts zu schaffen haben." See also Hatzfeldt's review of the German policy in a despatch to Münster, Dec. 26, 1881 (*Die Grosse Politik*, IV. 25). He there describes Bismarck's policy as "von Anfang an eine offene und leicht kenntliche", the object of which was "die Beschäftigung Frankreichs fern von der deutschen Grenze". Herbert Bismarck gave a similar explanation to Crispi in October, 1888 (Crispi, p. 280). The same point is well made by Matter (*Revue Politique et Littéraire*, 1907, pp. 166-170).

⁵⁸ As early as July 10, 1881, St. Vallier expressed regret that friction had arisen between England and France and confessed uneasiness lest France should become entirely dependent on German friendship (Bourgeois and Pagès, pp. 203-204).

the instrument of the conflict with France and should have himself created the situation which finally drove Italy into the arms of the central powers. He indeed overestimated the value of good-will and justice in politics, and even his most charitable critic would be forced to admit that he "lived in a world of continuous hallucinations".⁵⁹

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

⁵⁹ Torre, in *Curatulo*, p. 109.

UNITED STATES VS. JEFFERSON DAVIS, 1865-1869

JEFFERSON DAVIS became a prisoner of the United States in May, 1865, but it was not until February, 1869, that the law officers of the government finally and publicly pronounced him free from the possibility of legal prosecution. During these four years the history of his case presents a complex problem.

Had Abraham Lincoln lived, it is probable that Jefferson Davis would not have been pursued in his southern flight.¹ The assassination, however, changed the course of events. Investigation by the War Department convinced Secretary Stanton and the judge advocate general, Joseph Holt, that the murder had been committed with the knowledge and approval of Davis and some of the Confederate officials. Consequently a proclamation was issued offering a reward for the arrest of the Confederate president and an active pursuit resulted in his capture.²

Sufficient reliable evidence to substantiate the murder charge was never found,³ but President Johnson and his advisers neither with-

¹ Hugh McCulloch, *Men and Measures of Half a Century* (New York, 1888), p. 408; J. W. Schuckers, *Salmon P. Chase* (New York, 1874), p. 535; Edward A. Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis with a Secret History of the Southern Confederacy* (Philadelphia, 1869), p. 526; Varina H. Davis, *Memoir of Jefferson Davis* (New York, 1890), II. 696; record of conversation between Lincoln and General Sherman supplied by Dr. W. W. Folwell through the kindness of Jeannette P. Nichols.

² Proclamation of May 2, 1865; *War of the Rebellion: a Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (hereafter cited as *O. R.*, with the serial volume-numbers), vol. 100, pp. 310, 318; vol. 104, pp. 452, 483-484, 486; vol. 121, pp. 847-867, 976-978; Gideon Welles, *Diary*, II. 299-300; Stanton to Holt, May 2, 1865, in Stanton's Letter-Book, Library of Congress (hereafter L. of C.); *New York Herald*, Apr. 16, 25, 1865; *Century*, V. 130-145, XVII. 586-596.

³ Some testimony to this effect was supplied by witnesses in the trial of the assassination conspirators, but it was not sufficient to warrant a trial although the judge advocate general, Holt, was firmly convinced that Davis's guilt was sure. He began a search which brought to light a peculiarly talented charlatan, Charles A. Dunham, *alias* Sanford Conover, *alias* James Watson Wallace. He brought a group of witnesses to Holt who showed rather convincingly that Davis was guilty. These witnesses were not prepossessing and did not inspire confidence when examined by Seward and Johnson. Therefore nothing was done. Congress finally investigated, Apr.-June, 1866, and it was there that the whole testimony brought in by Dunham *et al.* was found to be a hoax. The best account of this affair is found in *O. R.*, vol. 121, pp. 847-867, 890, 921, 931-945, 962-965, 973, 976-978, and in David M. DeWitt, *Assassination of President Lincoln*, pp. 168, 171, 173-174, 180-181, and same author, *Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson*, pp.

drew the accusation nor set Davis at liberty. Instead they conceived the idea of punishing him for treason, a purpose which gradually transformed itself into a project for trying him in order that the highest courts might officially and finally declare secession to be treason. This decision was made in Cabinet during July, 1865, when it was unanimously agreed to try him for treason rather than murder and the contention of Seward and Harlan for a military court was overruled in favor of civil process. Attorney General Speed in association with special counsel, William M. Evarts, John H. Clifford, and Lovell H. Rousseau, undertook to prepare the case. After a careful consideration of details they decided that the trial must take place before the United States Circuit Court in the Virginia district, where Davis in person, as commander-in-chief of the Confederate forces, actually had levied war against the United States. Thus they discarded the plan, advocated by some, of trying him in one of the Northern states on the theory that he had been "constructively" present when his subordinates had invaded Northern territory. Their decision raised the question which those who advocated the "constructive presence" theory had wished to avoid, namely, could a jury be procured in Virginia or any state of the late Confederacy which would find Davis guilty?

But this was not the only difficulty. The circuit in which the district of Virginia was situated was presided over by Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase of the United States Supreme Court. He with the district judge, John C. Underwood, would sit as trial judges. One reason why Virginia had been chosen as the place was the fact that, as Chase presided there, the weight of his official position and prestige would give the greatest judicial authority possible to the proceedings.⁴ But when approached by the President Chase declined to appear in the Circuit Court until peace should be declared, feeling it to be beneath the dignity of justices of the Supreme Court to go into the war area until all possibility of military interference with civil court processes was removed; he advised Johnson that Congressional legislation was necessary.⁵ Nevertheless Chase felt

138-142, 153-156, 278-281 and n.; Holt MSS. in L. of C.; *Southern Historical Society Papers*, IX. 313-325.

⁴ Welles, *Diary*, II. 335, 337, 365, 608; *House Report* 7, 40 Cong., 1 sess. (Ser. 1314) (hereafter cited as *Ser. 1314*), testimony of Stanton, p. 397, testimony of Seward, pp. 379-382, testimony of Speed, pp. 798-804.

⁵ In pursuance of Chase's recommendation, Johnson asked Congress to pass legislation. Several bills were introduced to remove some technical difficulties (Senate Bills 34 and 103), but nothing was accomplished. Congress contented itself with making demands for information and finally conducting an investigation. *Congressional Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 67, 70, 100, 108, 115, 171-172,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—18.

it to be proper for the district judge to hold the Circuit Court in his absence.⁶ Speed did not think that Underwood was a suitable judge before whom to try Davis,⁷ so Chase's refusal and the jury difficulty postponed action until conditions should become more settled. In the meantime Davis was kept in confinement at Fort Monroe, isolated even from his family, and all requests of counsel for communication with him were ignored or refused.⁸

In April, 1866, immediately after the President's proclamation of partial peace, Attorney General Speed thought the time ripe for action, took up the case, and called the associate counsel to Washington.⁹ By this time, Clifford had become convinced that with conditions as they were the government could not possibly convict without filling the jury-box from a hand-picked panel, while a failure to secure a verdict would place the government in the position of having fought a successful war only to have it virtually declared unlawful by a Virginia jury.¹⁰ Chase also hindered proceedings by refusing to sit as long as certain minor military processes were being carried on in spite of the President's proclamation but with Johnson's approval.¹¹

226, 243, 265, 338, 472, 566, 1883, 1436, 1764; 39 Cong., 1 sess., *Senate Ex. Doc. 7 and 19*; 39 Cong., 1 sess., *House Ex. Doc. 46*; for House investigation see *Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 1791, 1854, and 39 Cong., 1 sess., *House Report 104*.

⁶ Robert B. Warden, *Salmon P. Chase* (Cincinnati, 1874), p. 645; Schuckers, *Chase*, p. 535; *Ser. 1314*, pp. 502-512, 798-804; 39 Cong., 1 sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. 19*; *O. R.*, vol. 121, pp. 715-716; Welles, *Diary*, II, 368.

⁷ *Ser. 1314*, pp. 798-799; Underwood had been a New York politician of Tammany Hall who had married a Virginia lady. He had lived in Virginia for a while before the war, but had made himself unpopular by attempting to preach abolition doctrines. He had joined the Republican party and had taken part in the campaigns of 1856 and 1860. When Lincoln in order to maintain the fiction of a loyal Virginia government recognized the Peirpoint regime, he appointed Underwood district judge. The latter was not well fitted for such office, because of his temperamental partisanship and his hatred of Virginians. Speed knew this and realized that a trial before him was likely to be disgraced by partisan irregularities; *New York World*, Dec. 6, 1867.

⁸ Dunbar Rowland, *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist* (Jackson, Miss., 1923) (hereafter cited as *Davis's Works*), VII, 26-38, 62, 77; *O. R.*, vol. 121, pp. 563-986 *passim*; Varina H. Davis, *Memoir of Davis*, II, 708-768; John J. Craven, *Prison Life of Jefferson Davis* (New York, 1866), *passim*.

⁹ Speed to Evarts and Clifford, Apr. 6, 1866, Attorney General's Letter-Book E, p. 471.

¹⁰ Clifford to Evarts, May 28, 1866, Evarts MSS.; this letter and a number of others were made available to me through the kindness of Allen W. Evarts, Esq.

¹¹ Greeley to Chase, May 4, June 3, 1866, Chase to Greeley, June 1, 1866, Chase MSS. (Pa. Hist. Soc.); Greeley to Chase, May 31, 1866, *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1902*, II, 514; Chase to Greeley, June 5, 1866, Chase to Nettie Chase, Apr. 16, May 14, 1866, Chase MSS. (L. of C.);

Clifford's opinion and Chase's refusal made another delay necessary, although Underwood attempted to advance matters by causing his grand jury to find an indictment against Davis for treason.¹² Because of the views of Clifford and Chase it appears that Johnson and perhaps Speed were not averse to granting release on bail until the trial might take place, but politics intervened to prevent this. The radicals were warring against Johnson and they hoped to make capital out of the Davis case. There was a widespread popular feeling that Davis should be punished as an example to traitors; and as the government had never withdrawn the charge of complicity in the assassination, many still believed him guilty of that crime. This belief was shared by a number of Congressmen and a Congressional committee was at work on an investigation of the charge. Testimony was in process of being gathered and the investigators were determined that Davis should not be released until they had come to some conclusion. Therefore the radical group, under the lead of George S. Boutwell, put a resolution of protest through the House and persuaded Underwood that it was an inopportune time to grant bail. The district judge consequently refused counsel's petition and Davis remained in Fort Monroe.¹³

At this juncture three of the President's Cabinet, including Speed, decided that they could support Johnson's reconstruction policy no longer and resigned; Henry Stanbery succeeded as attorney general in July, 1866. Soon thereafter it was brought to his attention that an adjourned session of the Circuit Court was scheduled to

Schuckers, *Chase*, pp. 536, 540-542; Chase to Underwood, May 2, June 10, 1866, Underwood MSS. (L. of C.); New York *Tribune*, Apr. 6, 7, 9, 27, 1866; New York *Herald*, Apr. 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 16, 21, 26, May 2, 3, 6, 1866; New York *Times*, Apr. 5, 6, 9, 10, 24, 27, May 7, 1866; New York *Evening Post*, Apr. 14, 1866; General Orders, No. 26, James Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington, 1897), VI. 440.

¹² Underwood suddenly informed Chandler, the district attorney, of his desire for an indictment and the latter had only three hours to put together hastily a short and inadequate document, *Ser. 1314*, pp. 502-512; for the text of the indictment and the efforts of Davis's counsel to obtain action under it see Bradley T. Johnson, *Reports of Cases decided by Chief Justice Chase in the Circuit Court of the United States for the 4th Circuit, 1865-1869* (New York, 1876). As that part of the above relating to Davis is found in more convenient form reprinted in Davis's *Works*, VII. 138-227, citations will be made from the latter edition.

¹³ McCulloch, *Men and Measures*, pp. 408-409; Davis, *Memoir of Davis*, II. 769-770; Davis's *Works*, VII. 156-159; Harrison to Phillips, June 27, 1866, Phillips MSS. (L. of C.); Fairfax Harrison, *Aris Sonis Focisque* (n. p., 1910), p. 196; *Publications of Mississippi Historical Society*, VIII. 81; W. W. Glenn to Harrison, May 30, 1866, Burton Harrison MSS. (L. of C.); Hon. F. B. Harrison not only gave the author permission to use these papers but also sent over others from Scotland for this purpose.

be held in Richmond in October. Since a final peace proclamation had been issued in August, Chase was now expected to be ready to hold court; but this latter expectation was not to be fulfilled. Chase found that Congress had intervened, inadvertently it seems,¹⁴ and had prevented the possibility of trial by rearranging the circuits while failing to make new assignments of Supreme Court justices. Therefore after consulting some of his fellow-judges the Chief Justice announced that without assignments the judges had no legal right to hold circuit courts.¹⁵ This situation caused Stanbery to advise that Davis be transferred from military custody to that of the civil authorities, arguing that as the war was over military imprisonment was illegal. Secretary of War Stanton opposed any such release until just before trial, contending that if he were released to the United States marshal he would then have to be housed in a Virginia state prison, where he would be neither so carefully guarded nor so well cared for as at Fort Monroe. Stanton's opposition prevailed, but correspondence of the President, Attorney General, and district attorney was published, indicating that the district attorney had been informed that Davis would be turned over to civil custody on demand and at the same time detailing the difficulties which were preventing trial or release from military custody.¹⁶

The next move came from Davis's counsel. Since the early days of his imprisonment in 1865, Davis's interests had been in the hands of well-known lawyers, chief of whom was Charles O'Connor, prominent New York Democrat of pronounced states'-rights and Southern sympathies.¹⁷ He had volunteered his services at the request of a

¹⁴ Act of July 23, 1866, *Stat. at L.*, XIV. 209.

¹⁵ Schuckers, *Chase*, pp. 540-542; Warden, *Chase*, p. 662; *Ser. 1314*, pp. 502-512; Chase to Underwood, Sept. 10, 1866, Underwood MSS.; Chase to his associates, Oct. 5, 1866, Chase to Judge Brooks, Nov. 6, 1866, Chase MSS. (Pa. Hist. Soc.); D. S. Freeman, *Calendar of Confederate Papers* (hereafter cited as *Confederate Calendar*), (Richmond, Va., 1908), pp. 468-469.

¹⁶ *Ser. 1314*, pp. 371, 544-548, 558-561; George C. Gorham, *Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton*, II. 210-211; Stanton MSS., under date Oct. 5, 1866 (L. of C.); Welles, *Diary*, II. 608, 614; MS. Diary of Orville H. Browning, entries of Oct. 2, 9, 12, 1866—these entries were supplied me through the interest of Professors Greene of Columbia and Pease of the University of Illinois; Davis's *Works*, VII. 161-164; Freeman, *Confederate Calendar*, p. 467.

¹⁷ The story of the activities of counsel is an interesting one, which has never been told. The most valuable material on the subject is to be found in Freeman, *Confederate Calendar*, pp. 439-485; these pages contain the papers of George Shea which are deposited in the Confederate Museum. Other sources are *Century*, XI. 636-644; *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XXIX. 45-81, XXXVII. 243-252; Jeremiah S. Black, Franklin Pierce, Philip Phillips, Burton Harrison, and Reverdy Johnson MSS. (L. of C.); Davis's *Works*, VII., VIII., IX.; Varina Davis, *Memoir of Jefferson Davis*, vol. II.; *O. R.*, vol. 121, pp. 563-986.

number of lawyers of similar views because practically all Southern lawyers were at that time barred from practising in the federal courts. For nearly two years O'Connor and his aids had been endeavoring, with no apparent success, to obtain for Davis a trial or release on bail. The government was not ready to try him, and as to bail Johnson told them that it was a matter for the courts; Chase told them it was a matter for Underwood to decide; Underwood decided that he had no authority because the prisoner was in military custody, subject to the President's order.

This three-cornered and endless shifting of responsibility was discouraging, but finally the way seemed clear. In March, 1867, Congress passed legislation definitely assigning the Supreme Court justices to their circuits.¹⁸ No one could foresee further excuses from Chase, therefore Davis's counsel decided to force the issue, to bring their client before the court on a writ of habeas corpus, and compel the government either to try him or to bail him. Of course there was a chance that the authorities might do neither, but remand him to a Virginia jail; but in view of the Johnson-Stanbery-Chandler correspondence this seemed hardly possible. Consequently notice of intended application was made to the district attorney, and on May 1 counsel appeared before Judge Underwood, who issued the writ, making it returnable on May 13, a date by which he felt certain that Chase would be on hand to preside.¹⁹

The first problem presented by the habeas corpus proceedings was whether the War Department would surrender Davis in response to the writ. It was feared by counsel that Stanton would block the move; in order to forestall his opposition Mrs. Davis had enlisted the sympathy of the war minister's close friend John W. Garrett, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. After he had a conference with Stanton the latter made no objection in Cabinet and the order was thereupon issued.²⁰

¹⁸ Act of Mar. 2, 1867, *Stat. at L.*, XIV. 433.

¹⁹ Davis's *Works*, VII. 99-101, 165-168; Chase to Underwood, Apr. 26, 1867, Chase Letter-Book (L. of C.); *Ser. 1314*, pp. 502-512, 581, 585; *Washington Chronicle*, May 1, 3, 4, 1867; *New York Times*, May 3, 1867; Freeman, *Confederate Calendar*, pp. 469-472.

²⁰ *Washington Chronicle*, May 1, 4, 1867; *New York Herald*, May 1, 1867; Davis's *Works*, VII. 168-169; *American Historical Review*, XIX. 99; *Baltimore Sun*, May 28, 1886; *Baltimore Herald*, July 10, 1887; E. M. Stanton to John W. Garrett, Apr. 20, 1867, W. Barnard to Garrett, Apr. 27, 1880, Mrs. Davis to Garrett, Apr. 10, May 1, 1867, Friday [May 3, 1867?], Dec. 10, 1867, Garrett to Mrs. Davis, June, 1867 (marked "not sent"); memorandum of inquiries to be made of Attorney General, Jefferson Davis to J. T. Scharf, Aug. 6, 1886, Garrett MSS. Permission to use the Garrett MSS. was given by Robert Garrett; *O. R.*, vol. 121, pp. 983-986.

The second question was whether Davis was to be tried. Underwood was ready, even eager, to do his part, but the district attorney, Lucius H. Chandler, was not prepared. He realized that the indictment he had so hurriedly drawn up the previous spring was not adequate, he was doubtful whether Chase would be present, he had never received any directions or aid from Washington. Consequently, he notified Evarts, the government's special counsel,²¹ of the developments, asked for his presence in Washington, and then went there himself. Here his embarrassment was, if anything, increased. He found that Stanbery had done nothing and was planning to do nothing. The Attorney General had announced in Cabinet the previous fall that he considered himself required to represent the government in cases before the Supreme Court only,²² and he now told this to Chandler and indicated that he considered the district attorney and Evarts responsible for the conduct of the Davis case.²³ Chandler, finding that no aid was to be forthcoming from the Attorney General's office, obtained the impression "somehow", as he later expressed it, that Chase would not sit, and hurried off with the mix-up to Evarts in New York. Evarts was also surprised. He had considered that Stanbery would follow Speed in the latter's intention to direct the case, and as he had received no word since the preceding August he had paid no more attention to the matter. After Chandler brought him his news he decided to delay departure to Washington no longer. At the capital Stanbery confirmed Chandler's statements. Evarts was not at all in agreement with the Attorney General's opinion and said as much, but to no avail.

This then was the situation. Attorney General Stanbery declined any responsibility; Chief Justice Chase could not be depended on to be present;²⁴ no one had confidence in District Judge Under-

²¹ Clifford had withdrawn from the case, Clifford to Stanbery, Aug. 14 and 27, 1866, Attorney General MSS. (L. of C.); Stanbery to Clifford, Aug. 22, 1866, Attorney General's Letter-Book F, p. 128 (L. of C.). Rousseau was now in the regular army and no longer connected with the case.

²² Browning Diary, Oct. 2, 9, 12, 1866.

²³ There is some evidence to lead to a belief that Stanbery had intimated his opinion to Davis's counsel, or at least that they had learned of his views, probably the latter, and for that reason they expected no trial; as they knew the government did not want to keep him in a Virginia jail, they hoped for bail. Davis's *Works*, VII. 167, 161-164; Freeman, *Confederate Calendar*, p. 472.

²⁴ Chase's oft-repeated refusal to sit in Virginia while martial law was in force was supposed by some to hold at this time because under the Reconstruction Act of Mar. 2, 1867, military government was established. Chase, himself, seems to have been uncertain and to have made ambiguous and misleading remarks. Davis's *Works*, VII. 165-166; *Ser. 1314*, pp. 544-546, 502-512, 581, 585; Chase to Underwood, Apr. 26, 1867, Chase Letter-Book (L. of C.); Underwood

wood; District Attorney Chandler was not even prepared with an adequate indictment in the case; special counsel Evarts was suddenly confronted with the fact that he was responsible for the conduct of an important and difficult prosecution within two weeks, without preparation or adequate assistants. Naturally there was but one thing certain in the minds of Evarts, Stanbery, and Chandler: there could be no trial that term.

The question yet remaining was whether bail should be granted. Evarts was inclined to doubt whether it could, but Stanbery and Chandler were of the opinion that such procedure was legal, and so it was decided, Saturday, May 10. On the same day the three law officers of the government admitted Davis's counsel to conference; they intimated to O'Connor that there would be no trial that term and that bail would be accepted. On Sunday, therefore, Evarts went to Richmond and late that evening performed a duty very distasteful to him.²⁵ He informed the disappointed Underwood that he was compelled to say that the government would not be ready for trial the next day and was therefore willing to accept bail.²⁶

O'Connor and his associates had prepared for the possibility of bail. For more than a year Horace Greeley, Gerrit Smith, and Cornelius Vanderbilt had been ready to act as sureties. Greeley had the reputation of large sympathy and Mrs. Davis had appealed to him for aid soon after her husband's arrest. He was further interested because a protégé of his, George Shea, was an assistant of O'Connor's in the legal steps involved in the case. The editor of the *Tribune* also represented a group to which belonged Henry Wilson, Gerrit Smith, ex-Governor Andrew of Massachusetts, and others. These desired universal amnesty, and in some cases universal suffrage, in the hope that the wounds of war might thus be healed and the negro gain most quickly the full benefits of his new-found freedom. Chase, May 10, 1867, Chase MSS. (L. of C.); Chase to Underwood, May 13, 1867, Underwood MSS. (L. of C.).

²⁵ It was not according to legal ethics for a lawyer to appear to instruct a judge; it would also seem to the public that the delay was caused by delinquency of counsel in charge of the case, when that was not the fact.

²⁶ For these proceedings there is a large body of evidence taken within a few weeks of the events themselves by the committee investigating Johnson's conduct. *Ser. 1314*, testimony of Seward, p. 371, Stanton, p. 397, Stanbery, pp. 421-427, 558-561, Chandler, pp. 502-512, Chase, pp. 544-549, Underwood, pp. 578 ff., Evarts, pp. 645-659; McCulloch, *Men and Measures*, pp. 408-409; New York *Herald*, May 4-13, 1867; New York *Tribune*, May 7, 11, 13, 1867; New York *Times*, May 13, 1867; Washington *Chronicle*, May 2-13, 1867; Washington *National Republican*, May 7, 8-10, 1867; *National Intelligencer* (Washington), May 6-14, 1867; Richmond *Enquirer*, May 4, 13, 1867; Springfield (Mass.) *Republican*, May 11, 1867 (weekly edition); Philadelphia *Inquirer*, May 13, 1867.

dom. Greeley, therefore, against the advice of his partisan Republican friends, had offered to lend his name to the enterprise of gaining a speedy trial or freedom for Davis. The aid of this prominent Republican was expected to do much to quiet criticism from members of that party, and it is stated that it was for that reason that Johnson demanded the use of Greeley's name. Bail was offered at \$100,000. This the government accepted and Underwood, after gravely deciding that the case was bailable, liberated the prisoner May 13, 1867, almost two years to a day from the date of his capture.²⁷

Elated with the smooth working of his plans, O'Connor, in the hour of his triumph, had written to his wife: "The business is finished. Mr. Davis will never be called upon to appear for trial."²⁸ In this opinion he was upheld by some of the press and there were many reasons why he should have been confident. During the two years which had elapsed circumstances had changed. War-bred enthusiasm for punishment had been deflected into the spirited contest between Johnson and his radical opponents. A new attorney general, unfamiliar with the 1865 psychosis of official Washington, was devoting his energies to providing legal authority for Johnson's actions in the conflict just mentioned. Grave doubts, too, had been expressed by John H. Clifford and other lawyers as to the possibility of obtaining a conviction. Popular sympathy in favor of Davis had developed in certain circles. He had not been considerably treated in prison and his weak nervous system had intensified the hardships of confinement. Accounts, some true and some exaggerated, of his sufferings had been given clever publicity. He gained some popular consideration when the charge of guilt in respect to the assassination was shown to have been based largely on an infamous hoax. In fine, sentiment for amnesty and the restoration of good feeling was growing.

²⁷ Davis's *Works*, VII. 165-176; James Parton, *Life of Greeley* (Boston, 1877), p. 531; L. U. Reavis, *Life of Greeley* (New York, 1872), pp. 67, 578-579; L. D. Ingersoll, *Life of Greeley* (Chicago, 1873), pp. 427-438; W. A. Linn, *Horace Greeley* (New York, 1903), p. 218; *Harper's Magazine*, CXXIV. 101; J. Russell Young, *Men and Memories* (second edition, New York, 1901), I. 117-119; *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XXXVII. 243-252; *Century Magazine*, XI. 636 *et seq.*; Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life* (New York, 1868), pp. 412 *et seq.*; *Publications of Mississippi Historical Society*, VIII. 84; Mrs. Burton N. Harrison, *Recollections Grave and Gay* (New York, 1911), pp. 263-268; *Ser. 1314*, p. 779; 40 Cong., 1 sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. 14*, p. 14; Charles O'Connor to Mrs. O'Connor, May 13, 1867, supplied through the courtesy and interest of Messrs. Charles W. Sloane and Charles O'C. Sloane; newspapers cited in preceding note for May 14, 15, and 18, 1867; *New York World*, May 14, 1867; *Cincinnati Commercial*, May 14, 1867; *Columbus (Ohio) Journal*, May 15, 1867; *Detroit Free Press*, May 15, 1867; *Philadelphia Press*, May 14, 1867.

²⁸ Charles O'Connor to Mrs. O'Connor, May 13, 1867.

In spite of these favorable indications, however, there were powerful influences which made it unlikely that the government would relinquish the purpose of bringing Davis to trial. There was a considerable though incommensurable element of public opinion which perpetuated the war hates and prejudices; not a few held the Confederate President responsible for the horrors of Andersonville and Libby Prison. President Johnson had never withdrawn the charge of complicity in the assassination and there existed the report of a Congressional committee affirming their belief in his complicity; many, therefore, were convinced that Davis was a murderer. This popular prejudice was fostered by the Congressional group hostile to the President as a good issue in their war with him. Also, more subtle and less easily traced was the hostility of Seward, Stanton, and Johnson. Thus O'Connor reckoned without his host. The wheels of the legal system of the United States did not cease revolving. Davis, though bailed, was still under indictment and was recognized to "well and truly" appear before the Circuit Court of the United States on the fourth Monday of November, 1867. The proper officials were well aware of the indictment and were making certain necessary preparations for the expected trial.

The most important action to be taken was the reorganization of the staff of associate counsel retained by the Attorney General. Such reorganization was necessary because Clifford and Rousseau had withdrawn from the case and Attorney General Stanbery definitely refused to take any active part. A conference was held in October between Evarts and District Attorney Chandler, which resulted in a decision to secure the services of Governor H. H. Wells of Virginia, a Reconstruction politician who was an expert criminal lawyer. It was expected that he would be on the ground and act as an ever-present counsellor to the local law officer. Evarts himself wished Clifford's place filled by his life-long friend Richard H. Dana, jr., a prominent Boston lawyer. Stanbery acquiesced in these arrangements and Wells and Dana were retained.²⁹ In closing the correspondence on this subject the Attorney General admonished Evarts, October 25, in these words: "I need not suggest to you that no time should be lost in making full preparations for trial."³⁰

²⁹ Chandler to Stanbery, Oct. 19, 1867, Attorney General MSS.; Stanbery to Evarts, to Chandler, to Dana, to Wells, Oct. 25, 1867, Attorney General's Letter-Book F, pp. 522-523; Evarts to Dana, Oct. 17, 24, 28, 1867, Richard H. Dana, Jr. MSS. (Mass. Hist. Soc.).

³⁰ Stanbery had expressed himself in his testimony before the impeachment investigation as opposed to submitting treason cases to a jury or to prosecuting for the crime, *Ser. 1314*, p. 561, still he expressed himself as expecting to try Davis, *ibid.*, pp. 425-427.

With reorganization accomplished, Evarts and Dana went over the case. Evarts's state of mind is best illustrated by a statement in his letter to Dana asking him to be his associate: "It may be that the trial will take place at the end of November, more likely in May next, as likely as either, not at all." This letter, written October 17, indicates uncertainty which may or may not have been dispelled by the Attorney General's words of October 25. At any rate Evarts and Dana came to the conclusion that before a trial could be brought on a new indictment must be found and that no trial should take place except before Chase. These difficulties did not seem insuperable. Chandler and Wells busied themselves about the indictment and the Chief Justice offered to hold court two weeks earlier than the date set, in order that the trial might be held before his Supreme Court duties called him back to Washington. O'Connor was unwilling to accept this earlier date, presumably because it would mean a hurried trial, or one which might have to be finished before Underwood if Chase had to leave, and also because of the fact that the letter of the Chief Justice got into the papers and its tone offended Davis's friends.³¹

Government counsel also were not anxious for a hurried trial on another quickly constructed indictment and, besides, recent actions of Underwood made it increasingly necessary that he should have no opportunity to exercise any independent functions in this case. He seemed to have a peculiarly unfortunate temperament and an uncanny aptitude for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. Three of his remarks had made him especially famous, or infamous; he had testified before the Reconstruction Committee, in 1866, that successful treason trials could be held in Virginia only if the jury were packed, and expressed confidence in his ability to pack said jury. He had charged his grand jury at Richmond in terms which contained insulting allusions to the moral character of the citizens, and to cap the climax he had recently announced that he would be able to get a proper jury to find Davis guilty and that he would fine him enough to take away his Mississippi plantations, which Underwood

³¹ Evarts and Dana to Stanbery, Nov. 2, 1867, Chandler to Stanbery, Nov. 6, 1867, Attorney General MSS.; Stanbery to Chandler, Nov. 4, 1867, to Evarts, Nov. 4, 9, 1867, to Dana, Nov. 9, 1867, Attorney General's Letter-Book F, pp. 532-533, 549; Evarts to Dana, Oct. 28, 1867, Dana MSS.; O'Connor to Philip Phillips, Oct. 19, 1867, Phillips MSS.; Freeman, *Confederate Calendar*, pp. 473-478; Chase to Underwood, Oct. 22, 1867, Chase Letter-Book (L. of C.); Chase to Underwood, Nov. 23, 1867, Underwood MSS.

would then sell to ex-slaves for a half-dollar an acre. These remarks entirely destroyed his usefulness as a trial judge.³²

In view of these facts Evarts and Dana desired to wait till spring, and induced Stanbery, after some hesitation, to agree. This conclusion the Cabinet refrained from questioning, although Seward felt that trial before Underwood would be preferable to another delay. Therefore, in spite of considerable newspaper expectancy and the presence of Davis and his counsel, all of whom were gathered in Richmond, Evarts moved for a postponement, giving as his reason technical difficulties caused by the Chief Justice's absence. His motion was not opposed by Davis's counsel, and an order was entered on the record setting the case down for the fourth Wednesday in March next, with the stipulation that if the Supreme Court was still in session the action might be postponed until that court had adjourned.³³

With the trial date now set for a time when there at last seemed no possibility of further delay, government counsel had next to see that a valid indictment was found. Chandler and his associate Wells, therefore, had been directed by Evarts during his November sojourn in Richmond to examine witnesses before the grand jury and present the proper evidence so that Dana and Evarts might draw the instrument. But Chandler and Wells failed to show results, without explaining why. This was disquieting to Evarts, for by law all indictments must be found within three years after the offense; this was interpreted to mean not later than April, 1868, and here it was February. Out of patience, he at length wrote the district attorney a decided letter recounting to him his various shortcomings. He reminded him that his delay had already made it necessary to consider postponing the trial once more and was endangering the possibility of procuring a new indictment. He urged activity in regard to the finding of the indictment, and advised that he see the Attorney General about postponing the trial. He sent

³² 39 Cong., 1 sess., *House Report* 30, Testimony, pt. II., p. 10; *New York World*, July 28, 1866; *Washington Chronicle*, May 7, 1867; *Publications of Mississippi Historical Society*, VIII. 84; *Davis's Works*, VII. 126-129; Bagley to Stanbery, Nov. 21, 1867; Attorney General MSS.; *New York Times*, Oct. 28, 1867; *Richmond Enquirer and Examiner*, Nov. 25, 1867.

³³ Browning Diary, entry for Nov. 12, 1867; Evarts to Dana, Nov. 15, 1867, Dana to Mrs. Dana, Nov. 24, 25, 1867, Dana MSS.; *Davis's Works*, VII. 135, 176-179; Dana to Evarts, June 16, 1869, Evarts MSS. (copies of all letters of Evarts to Dana are to be found also in this collection); *New York Herald*, Oct. 5, Nov. 6, 25, 27, 1867; *Richmond Enquirer and Examiner*, Nov. 26, 1867; *Washington Chronicle*, Nov. 26, 1867.

copies of this letter to Stanbery, Dana, and Wells.³⁴ Thus spurred on, Chandler and Wells finished their work and Evarts and Dana came to Washington. They reviewed all the evidence and testimony taken and Dana drew up an elaborate document detailing many overt acts and covering many pages. The Richmond grand jury made this an indictment against Davis on March 26, 1868. It had taken the United States legal force nearly three years to make the first formal move toward prosecution.³⁵

These difficulties with the Virginia legal talent had a decided influence on Davis's fate. The inefficiency and lack of co-operation displayed by Chandler seem to have been last straws to Evarts. He had been fully aware of Clifford's objections to attempting a trial, but for motives of political prudence or because he had hoped that time would work out some other solution he had never concurred with them. Now the inefficiency of the Virginia associates, the constant delay, and, perhaps, the continued consideration of Clifford's reasoning, seconded by Dana's opinion, led Evarts to suggest to the latter that they advise the Attorney General to drop the case. Dana concurred and at Evarts's instance prepared a letter giving their joint opinion. When this paper reached Evarts in March, events had taken a new turn and he thought it wise to do nothing for the present. Politics had intervened once more.³⁶

Johnson's enemies in Congress had been long seeking for ground upon which to frame an impeachment against him. Some of the most bitter believed that the President had a guilty knowledge of the assassination plot; they had prevented the release of Davis on bail in 1866, and when he was released in 1867 the committee then investigating Johnson's every act closely questioned all of the officials connected with the case to find out whether the President had permitted Davis's release without all possible effort to procure his trial. They vainly hoped that some criminal purpose to shield a public

³⁴ Evarts to Dana, Jan. 7, 22, Feb. 9, 16, 18, 1868, Dana MSS.; Evarts to Stanbery, to Chandler, Feb. 18, 1868, Attorney General MSS. In this connection Stanbery's chief clerk gave him a statement which showed that this was by no means the first time Chandler had been delinquent, Pleasants to Stanbery, Feb. 20, 1868, Attorney General MSS.

³⁵ Evarts to Dana, Feb. 26, Mar. 3, 13, 15 (2 letters), 16 (telegram), 1868; Dana to Mrs. Dana, Mar. 22, 1868, Dana MSS.; Dana to Evarts, June 16, 1869, Evarts MSS.; Stanbery to Chandler, Mar. 2, 1868 (telegram), Attorney General's Instruction Book A1, p. 25; Chandler to Stanbery, Mar. 2, 1868 (telegram), Attorney General's Record of Letters Received, Book 2 under date; Browning to Dana, Mar. 16, 1868, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, p. 104; Dana to Pleasants, Mar. 25, 1868, Attorney General MSS.; Davis's *Works*, VII. 178-195; New York *Herald*, Mar. 29, 1868.

³⁶ Evarts to Dana, Jan. 22, Feb. 16, 18, 26, Mar. 3, 1868, Dana MSS.

enemy might be detected. They failed, but when Stanton was removed in violation of the Tenure of Office Act they made this action the basis of impeachment proceedings. Johnson was summoned to appear before the Senate, sitting as a high court of impeachment. In consequence, the Chief Justice, as the officer presiding over this body, could not go to Richmond in March to preside at Davis's trial. Furthermore, Evarts was retained as one of the President's counsel. Under these circumstances the trial was postponed on March 26 until May 2, and Evarts did not present the letter which he had received from Dana recommending that the government drop the Davis case.

May 2, however, found the impeachment trial still in process and so, after conference with Chase, Evarts arranged to change the date to June 2 with the possibility of setting the case over until fall. As soon as his argument before the court was concluded and the first verdict known, Evarts went up into New England to recuperate and to confer with Dana. They decided to ask O'Connor to agree to postpone until fall. Just why this was done is nowhere stated but it may be laid to the following causes. Evarts was naturally rather exhausted with the ordeal of the impeachment. It is likely that as he had very lately been desirous of dropping action, he was now no more enthusiastic over starting any. Besides, Richmond in June was not a pleasant place climatically in which to hold a long and important trial. These reasons seem sufficient, but there may have been others.

Thereupon Evarts had a conference with O'Connor. The latter had had some anxious days during the impeachment; if Johnson were removed, "Ben" Wade, implacable radical, would be in office and the trial of Davis might be pushed with impeachment methods. In view of this possible contingency O'Connor had gone so far as to advise Davis, in the event of Johnson's removal, to flee the country and "jump his bail". Relieved by the failure of the impeachment, and also perhaps appreciating Richmond climate, O'Connor agreed with Evarts to wait until the November term.⁸⁷

June 3, 1868, was a day which should have been long remembered in Richmond, for it was then that Chief Justice Chase appeared in person to hold the Circuit Court. After nearly three years of waiting Chase at last was prepared, but no one else was.

⁸⁷ Chase to Underwood, Mar. 29, 1868, Underwood MSS.; DeWitt, *Impeachment of Andrew Johnson*, p. 407; Evarts to Dana, Mar. 3, Mar. 13, Mar. 15 (2 letters), Apr. 23, May 11, May 19, May 31, 1868, Dana MSS.; information supplied by Charles W. Sloane, Esq.; New York *Herald*, Apr. 29, May 3, 1868; Richmond *Enquirer and Examiner*, May 4, 1868; Davis's *Works*, VII. 195.

The district attorney, even, was not in attendance; a Mississippi lawyer read the agreement between Evarts and O'Connor for postponing the case and there was nothing for the court to do but to concur. This was not to Chase's liking, at least so he stated; he delivered himself of the pronouncement that a year ago in May, or during the preceding fall, or at the present, would have been much more convenient than the coming November; but nevertheless, in spite of his other duties, he would try to attend. Thus the distinguished witnesses, including Lee, Cooper, and Letcher, might once again return to their homes, and an almost comic interlude was written into the lengthy drama.³⁸

Now occur changes in the *dramatis personae*. Attorney General Stanbery, who had resigned to lead Johnson's defense, failed of confirmation by the Senate when Johnson restored him to his former place. The President thereupon turned to Evarts for his new Attorney General at a time when the latter was considering once more the submission of Dana's letter. Evarts accepted the executive offer, but before he assumed office, or was able to do more in the Davis matter, Johnson sought to close the case.³⁹ The Democratic Convention was about to assemble in New York City and the President would have liked a nomination from that body; his friends advised that a general amnesty would aid his chances. Whether this ambition was the only cause of his proposed action cannot be dogmatically stated, but the fact remains that on June 26 Johnson proposed to his Cabinet the issue of such a proclamation.⁴⁰ The Cabinet was generally favorable, but Seward wished to except those against whom legal proceedings were pending, Davis and Surratt. Seward drew up a proclamation granting amnesty to all save those under indictment.

To this the Cabinet assented, but Johnson was not satisfied. He felt that all should be included, even Davis. For this reason in get-

³⁸ An order of continuance was entered and bail was renewed for appearance on the fourth Monday of November. Davis's *Works*, VII. 195-196, 237 n.; New York *Herald*, June 4, 1868; Chase to Schuckers, June 3, 1868, Chase MSS. (Schuckers Collection, L. of C.). Evarts anticipated Chase's grievance and seemed to feel that it was assumed, perhaps, for political purposes; it was a presidential year, Evarts to Dana, May 31, 1868, Dana MSS.

³⁹ R. B. Mosher, *Executive Register*, p. 178. Evarts was nominated June 22, but did not assume office until July 20.

⁴⁰ Johnson received a request from ten prominent citizens of New York City that his name be allowed to go before the convention, June 24, 1868; he received daily reports of proceedings from W. W. Warden, June 28, 29, July 1, 5, 1868; J. O. Perryman, July 6, 1868, Johnson MSS. There is reason to believe that Johnson had been considering a general amnesty since the preceding summer, Davis's *Works*, VII. 127-128.

ting Seward's document ready for the press he made it broad enough to include everybody. Before issuing it, however, he called in Browning, secretary of the interior, and Welles, secretary of the navy, for final advice. Browning was especially decided against the President's plan. He argued very earnestly that as Davis was under indictment the radicals would make his release from the possibility of punishment the basis of another impeachment. A second trial would be especially dangerous because a number of carpet-bag products of military reconstruction had been admitted to the Senate recently and these could be counted on to convict. This fear seems strangely remote to-day, but in the year 1868, Johnson's Cabinet could imagine anything. Browning's reasoning carried weight and the proclamation of July 4 excepted those "under presentment or indictment in any court of the United States having competent jurisdiction upon a charge of treason or other felony".⁴¹

Shortly after this episode Evarts took over his duties as attorney general. He had not been long in office before Dana called his attention to the advisability of closing the case without further proceeding. In order to facilitate this step Evarts asked his associate for another "spontaneous" letter setting forth the reason for stopping the prosecution.

When the fall term approached he sent Dana's letter to the President for his private consideration. After the election⁴² there was no need for secrecy and on November 6 Evarts read the letter to the Cabinet. The communication contained an opinion similar to the one Clifford had given nearly three years before; an opinion which had been bothering the government legal force ever since. Dana summed up this argument as follows:

. . . by pursuing the trial, the Government can get only a re-affirmation by a Circuit Court . . . of a rule of public law settled for this country in every way in which such a matter can be settled [*i.e.*, by war], only giving to a jury drawn from the region of the rebellion a chance to disregard the law when announced. It gives that jury a like opportunity to ignore the fact that Jefferson Davis took any part in the late Civil War. And one man upon the jury can secure these results. The risks of such absurd and discreditable issue of a great state trial are assumed for the sake of a verdict which, if obtained, will settle nothing in law or national practice not now settled, and nothing in fact not now history, while no judgment rendered thereon do we think will be ever executed.

⁴¹ Browning Diary, entries for June 26, 30, July 2, 3, 1868; Welles, *Diary*, III. 394-396; proclamation of July 4, 1868.

⁴² Evarts to Dana, Aug. 10, Oct. 9, 17, 1868, Dana MSS.; Dana to Evarts, Aug. 24, 1868, Attorney General MSS. and Johnson MSS.; Evarts to Johnson, to Dana, Oct. 9, 1868, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, pp. 270-271.

Besides these reasons, and perhaps because of them, I think that the public interest in the trial has ceased among the most earnest and loyal citizens.

Evarts gave this opinion his own endorsement and stated that in addition there was the usual difficulty: Chase would not be able to preside because the Supreme Court opened the week following the date set for the trial, and Evarts and Dana were still unwilling to have the matter brought on before Underwood. In view of these circumstances the Attorney General recommended that the President issue a final amnesty proclamation and "close out the rebellion"; this would enable the district attorney to enter a *nolle prosequi* and the case would be dropped. Seward and Welles were averse but the others, including Johnson, seemed agreeable, and Evarts was assigned the duty of drawing up the necessary papers. The President, however, could not make up his mind to issue the proclamation, and when the Cabinet of November 20 broke up without taking any action⁴³ Evarts wrote immediately to the new district attorney, S. Ferguson Beach, to postpone the proceedings set for November 23, until some time after the Supreme Court had adjourned, presumably in March or April. He sent a copy of this letter to O'Connor.⁴⁴

O'Connor decided to submit to delays no longer. He determined again to force action. He had learned from Shea that in an interview between Chase and the latter the Chief Justice had given his opinion that the Fourteenth Amendment prevented further proceedings. This enactment had disqualified from office-holding such men as Davis; Chase declared this disqualification to be a punishment for treason, and, as no one might be twice punished for the same crime, all legal action to be forestalled thereby. Taking advantage of his knowledge of this opinion O'Connor undertook to move that the indictment be quashed. He believed that this plan would be successful unless obstacles were thrown in the way "by the venomous personal interference of . . . a secret cowardly snake-in-the-grass official [in Washington] who [had] hitherto done his best to keep the screws upon [Davis and counsel], but who [had tried] to seem very innocent and indifferent".⁴⁵ He informed Evarts and the district

⁴³ Browning Diary, entries for Nov. 6, 20, 1868.

⁴⁴ Very soon after Evarts's assumption of office the delinquent Chandler was removed and his place taken by S. Ferguson Beach. Underwood to Evarts, Oct. 30, 1868; Beach to Evarts, Aug. 20, 1868, Attorney General MSS.; Evarts to Beach, Aug. 21, 1868, Attorney General Instruction Book A 1, p. 111; Evarts to Beach, Nov. 20, 1868, *ibid.*, p. 146; Evarts to O'Connor, Nov. 28, 1868, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, p. 294; Beach to Evarts, Nov. 28, 1868 (first letter). Attorney General MSS.

⁴⁵ O'Connor to Pratt, Garrett, and Glenn, Nov. 27, 1868, Garrett MSS.; O'Connor to Burton Harrison, July 13, 1866, Burton Harrison MSS. By inference this

attorney of his intention. The Attorney General notified Dana to be in readiness to oppose this motion.⁴⁶

The case came before the Circuit Court November 30–December 3; Chase and Underwood were both on the bench. On an appointed day O'Connor and Ould argued that the Fourteenth Amendment, because it had inflicted punishment, barred further prosecution. Dana, assisted by Beach and Wells, denied the validity of the defendant's contention. The Constitution, Dana said, was not criminal law, but established an organic political system; consequently, the clause referred to could not be a penalty, but only one of several phrases defining the qualifications necessary for holding certain offices in this organic system. On December 5, Chase announced that he and Underwood could not agree; a certificate of division therefore was entered in the minutes and sent to the Supreme Court. The district attorney then asked that a day be set for trial after the coming session of the Supreme Court, a desire shared by O'Connor. Chase said that the matter could be left open until it was definitely known when the Supreme Court would finish its winter term.⁴⁷

But no further date was ever to be set. Evarts had surmised that O'Connor's move was made to get the case referred to the Supreme Court during the coming term. We may also suspect that he feared that Chase's reasoning would influence a majority of the court to quash the indictment. This would be a defeat for the government, and so, possibly in order to avoid this contingency, he offered to enter a *nolle prosequi* if the defendant's counsel would agree to drop proceedings and not call up the case in the Supreme Court; O'Connor assented.⁴⁸ On Christmas Day Johnson issued Evarts's proclamation granting complete amnesty to all participants in the allusion can be applied to Seward. O'Connor expresses several times a suspicion of a malign influence which Blackford says was Seward, *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XXIX. 45–81. Accounts of Cabinet meetings indicated that Seward was generally opposed to leniency, and well he might be. He could never forget the awful assassination night in which he and his two sons nearly lost their lives and from the shock of which Mrs. Seward died.

⁴⁶ Beach to Evarts, Nov. 28, 1868 (2 letters), Attorney General MSS.; Evarts to Dana, to O'Connor, Nov. 28, 1868, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, pp. 316, 318; Evarts to Beach, Nov. 29, 1868, Attorney General's Instruction Book A 1, pp. 150, 153.

⁴⁷ Davis's *Works*, VII. 196–227, VIII. 361; Chase to Nettie Chase, Dec. 3, 1868, Chase MSS. (L. of C.); Beach to Evarts, Dana to Evarts, Nov. 30, 1868 (telegrams), Attorney General MSS.; Evarts to Beach, Nov. 30, 1868, Attorney General's Instruction Book A 1, p. 154; Evarts to Dana, Nov. 30, 1868, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, p. 320. Underwood refused to join Chase in agreement to quash the indictment.

⁴⁸ Evarts to Beach, Nov. 29, 1868, Attorney General's Instruction Book A 1, p. 153; *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XXXVIII. 347–349.

late rebellion. On this ground a *nolle prosequi* was entered in the Circuit Court in February, and a few days later Evarts moved that the certificate of division be dismissed by the Supreme Court.⁴⁹ On February 26, 1869, the Attorney General wrote the defendant's legal advisers that instructions had been given to *nolle prosequi* all indictments for treason alleged to have been committed during the late war and that his office had "no information of any such prosecutions" pending anywhere against Jefferson Davis.⁵⁰

ROY FRANKLIN NICHOLS.

⁴⁹ Proclamation of Dec. 25, 1868; Richmond *Enquirer and Examiner*, Feb. 12, 1869; *National Intelligencer* (Washington), Feb. 20, 1869.

⁵⁰ Evarts to C. E. Hooker *et al.*, Feb. 26, 1869, Attorney General's Letter-Book G, p. 402. The expense of this case to the government was not inconsiderable and makes an interesting item; counsel fees alone amounted to \$21,950; Evarts received \$10,540, Dana, \$5500, Wells, \$3500, Clifford, \$2500; Rousseau died before the payments to the early counsel were made. Evarts to Stanbery, May 24, Otto to Stanbery, June 10, Nov. 14, 1867, Browning to Hoar, Mar. 6, 1869, Attorney General MSS.; Wells to Evarts, July 14, 1868, Attorney General's Record of Letters Received, Book 2, under date, Browning to Evarts, Aug. 22, 1868, *ibid.*, Book 3, under date; Stanbery to Otto, June 8, 1867, Attorney General's Letter-Book F, p. 405, to Browning, Nov. 14, 1867, *ibid.*, p. 555, Evarts to Browning, Dec. 2, 1868, Jan. 28, 1869, *ibid.*, G, pp. 321, 349, Evarts to Clifford, Feb. 11, 1869, *ibid.*, p. 362, to Browning, Mar. 2, 1869, *ibid.*, p. 407, Hoar to Evarts, to Dana, Sept. 22, 1869, *ibid.*, H, p. 55; Evarts to Dana, Feb. 12, July 22, 1869, Dana MSS.; Dana to Evarts, June 16, 1869, Evarts MSS.

DOCUMENTS

Despatches of Castelnau de la Mauvissière (on Frobisher, Gilbert, de la Roche, Drake), 1577-1581

[The attention of the editor was called to the series of despatches from which the following extracts have been taken, by Dr. Conyers Read, who placed at his disposal copies of three of them which he had derived from Armand Baschet's transcripts in the British Public Record Office, made from manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Through the kindness of Mr. Waldo G. Leland and Mr. Abel Doysié photographic copies of eight despatches of Castelnau have been obtained from the originals in Paris. From these the following texts have been derived, embracing all the passages relating to America. The first two, which are from the original despatches sent, are from the Cinq Cents de Colbert, no. 337; the others are from MSS. Français, no. 15973, and apparently represent the ambassador's office copies kept in a letter-book, and numbered as follows: no. 208, July 4, 1578; no. 209, July 7, 1578; no. 209 (*sic*), July 13, 1578; no. 222, Oct. 17, 1578; no. 307, Nov. 2, 1580; and no. 322, April 9, 1581. The editor gladly expresses his obligations to Professor Gilbert Chinard, of the Johns Hopkins University, who transcribed or collated from the photographs several of the letters. In the preparation of the text, accents have been added where their absence might obscure the sense. ED.]

THE letters printed below were despatched to the French court by Michel de Castelnau, seigneur de la Mauvissière, during the time he was resident French ambassador at the court of Elizabeth. When these letters were written Castelnau was seeking to arrange a marriage between Elizabeth and François, duke of Anjou, the younger brother of the French king. Elizabeth appeared to favor the match and revealed her favor by her exceptional friendliness to the French ambassador. The fact that such a match would in some sort serve to unite England and France in the face of Spain gives a special significance to the queen's use of Castelnau's sword in knighting Sir Francis Drake, alluded to in letter VIII. below. Generally speaking, Castelnau was popular at the English court, notwithstanding his zealous efforts in behalf of the captive Mary Stuart, and he was on particularly friendly terms with Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's

principal secretary and an ardent exponent of English maritime enterprise. Castelnau was a gentleman, a scholar, and a good swordsman, with a brilliant military record in the French civil wars behind him, and a wide diplomatic experience. He remained in England ten years (1575-1585), and during that decade wrote his *Mémoires*, which he never completed, but which remain one of the best extant accounts of the French civil disorders between 1559 and 1570. He returned to France with a sadly diminished purse in 1585. He died seventeen years later, at the age of seventy-two.

Outside the letters printed below there is nothing in the known facts about him which reveals any interest on his part in the New World or in maritime enterprise, except for the fact that in 1557 he was for a short time in command of one of the French king's galleys in the Mediterranean. It is not recorded that he ever participated in a naval engagement.

His *Mémoires* have been printed many times. The best edition of them, including much additional material about him and his connections, was edited by Le Laboureur and printed in Brussels in three volumes folio in 1731. For his diplomatic correspondence while in England, reference should be made to C. Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, III. 460; compare also, for his English embassy, G. Hubault, *L'Ambassade de Castelnau en Angleterre* (St. Cloud, 1856-1857). An engraved portrait of Castelnau by Jasper Isac appears in the first edition of his *Mémoires*, edited by his son and published in Paris, 1621.

CONYERS READ.

I. CASTELNAU TO HENRY III. (October 9, 1577.)

... Ung nommé Forbichet¹ est retourné de son voyage et nouvelle navigation avec quelque quantité de mynes d'or, de quoy ilz disent qu'ilz tireront ung grand proffict et que les Angloyz veulent s'impatroniser des pays qu'il a descouvertz sur ce costé du Nord en tirant vers le Cattaye, pour y faire une nouvelle Angleterre. J'escriray l'un de ces jours particulièrement le tout à Vostre Majesté comme il est à la verité, affin qu'elle en face tel jugement qu'il luy plaira et y prenne part, si elle le trouve bon, comme en lieu d'une nouvelle conquête où peu de despence quelquefois apporte grandes commoditez et contentemens. Surquoy je supplierai Dieu,

Sire, qu'il donne à Vostre Majesté en tres heureuse prosperité tres heureuse et tres longue Vie. De Londres le ix jour d'octobre 1577.

Votre tres humble et tres obeissant

Subject et Serviteur

M. DE CASTELNAU.

¹ Sir Martin Frobisher. He had arrived at Milford Haven, from his second voyage, Sept. 23.

Despatches of Castelnau de la Mauvissière 287

II. CASTELNAU TO CATHERINE DE' MEDICI. (October 9, 1577.)

. . . Neantmoins ung nommé Forbichet, comme j'en touche ung mot en la lettre du Roy, est apret pour allonger les bornes d'Angleterre en pays de nouvelle conqueste vers le Nort et chemin assez court où les terres sont si larges et spacieuses et si pleines de mines d'or comme il a faict rapport à son retour que si Voss Majestés y veullent prendre part, il leur sera tres facile et aysé, sans prejudicier ny entreprendre rien sur la conqueste des Espagnolz et Portugais et au present que leur en feist le Pape. Je pense que c'est le voyage qu'un nommé d'Albaigne² qui estoit à la Rochelle proposa ung jour au feu Roy Charles vostre filz et a vous, où il y a de quoi faire des Empires et des Monarchies de plus de sept ou huit cens lieues de terres et pays aysez à conquerir et à garder et moyen d'aller par terre de là jusques aux conquestes desd. Espagnolz et Portugais, Mais qu'ilz ayent faict l'espreuve de la grande quantité de mines qu'ilz ont apportees, je manderay à Vostre Majesté ce qui en sera, et les apprestz qu'ilz feront pour y retourner. . . ne sera plus que pour supplier Dieu,

Madame, Qu'il donne à Vostre Majesté en tres heureuse prosperité tres heureuse et tres longue vie. De Londres le ix^e jour d'octobre 1577.

Votre tres humble et tres obessant

Subject et Serviteur

M. DE CASTELNAU.

III. To HENRY III. (July 4, 1578.)

Deulx Cent Huictiesme Despesche
du iii^e Juillet 1578

Au Roy

Sire, J'ay quelquefois escript à Vostre Majesté comme les deux dernieres années passées ung Angloys nommé Forbichet est allé avec quelques vaisseaulx essayer à descouvrir par le costé du nort s'il pourroit trouver ung destroit pour passer au Cattay affin d'avoir la navigation de ce costé là plus facile pour les espiceries et autres marchandises dont les Angloys usent beaucoup. J'ay aussi escript à Vostre Majesté comme en son premier voyage il avoit trouvé quelques terres pour y prendre pied en intention d'y faire quelque belle colonie à l'Angleterre et que pour estre party trop tard à l'occasion des froidures n'avoit peu faire toute la navigation jusques audit Cattay mais qu'il avoit trouvé comme il a rapporté plusieurs bonnes advantures en quelques endroictz de la Terre Neufve vers Estotilant et vers les ysles appellées Grenelant et Yslant où il avoit trouvé abondance de mynes d'or dont il a apporté icy fort grande quantité pour faire les espreuves qui seroyent revenues à si grand proffict touz fraicz faicts qu'il se seroit trouvé plusieurs contributaires qui y ont mis argent, mesmement aucuns de ce conseil qui espèrent d'y avoir proffict et sur cela ont esté tous d'opinion de faire reprendre audict Forbichet en ceste année icy les arres des precedentes et de luy donner les moyens de retourner plus fort de navires d'hommes de victuailles et munitions et de l'equipaige pour reprendre pied et sejourner tout l'hyver s'il est besoing pour faire des fortz. Et ainsi, Sire, le dict Forbichet est party il y a quelques jours³

² Spoken of elsewhere in these letters as a young Italian, Francisco d'Albani or d'Albano. The editor has not been able to identify him. The name does not appear, for instance, in the elaborate indexes to the ten volumes of the *Correspondance de Catherine de Médicis*.

³ He sailed from Harwich, on his third voyage, May 31, 1578.

en esperance de ne perdre pas son voyage et de s'y faire grand et y acquerir beaucoup d'honneur et de commoditez à l'Angleterre qui est cause de m'en faire escrire encores ce mot à Votre Majesté. . . .

IV. To HENRY III. (July 7, 1578.)

Deulx Cent Neufiesme despeche
du vii^e Juillet

Au Roy

Sire, Sur ce qu'il a pleu à Vostre Majesté m'escrire et faire escrire par le Sieur Marquis de la Roche qu'il n'entreprendroit rien qui fust prejudiciable à la Roynie d'Angleterre et à son estat, C'est chose de quoy elle se tient aujourd'hui bien assurée, Mais comme elle est desireuse et conseillée de rechercher les endroitz du monde où elle se pourroit accroistre et aggrandir par la navigation, Elle a permis à ung Gentilhomme de son Royaume appellé le chevallier Gilbert,⁴ fort advisé, de s'en aller faire une descouverte avec sept ou huict vaisseaux fort bien armez et equippez de toutes choses, par la partie australe où il y a une infinité de terres inhabitées d'autres que de sauvaiges et qui sont en mesme paralelle et climat que la France et l'Angleterre et au plus loing de quarante cinq et cinquante degrez de l'equinoctial, tirant à l'autre Pole, où il y a à faire des Empires et des Monarchies lesquelles choses Gilbert en a communiqué avec moy sur ce qu'il m'a dict avoir entendu estre aussi le desseing dudit Sieur de La Roche,⁵ auquel il m'a prié d'escrire que s'ilz se rencontrent en mesme temps sans chercher à se combatre et deffaire l'ung l'autre en pays si loingtain où la terre est assez grande pour tous qu'ilz se souffrent amiablement et que le premier arrivé des deux prenne la main gauche ou la main droite comme il luy plaira prendre l'autre choisir ce qui luy sera commode et m'a prié du mesme pour tel francoys qui y pourroit ou voudroit entreprendre ce que j'ay estimé ne debvoir celer à Vostre Majesté si c'est chose qui la touche et voz serviteurs et subjectz comme meritant bien d'y penser et adviser si Vostre Majesté ou eulx y ont quelque desseing. C'est chose de quoy le feu Admiral de Chastillon⁶ m'a souvent parlé à La Rochelle lorsque le feu Roy votre frere et Vostre Majesté m'y envoyerent pour l'establissement de la paix et en ramenay ung Italien appellé Francisque d'Albaigne⁷ qui scavoit ceste navigation où il estoit très affectionné de la représenter pour chose très utile au bien et grandeur de Vostre Royaume comme aussi le dict Admiral en ce temps là desiroit persuader au feu Roy et à plusieurs francoys ceste entreprise et eut lors la connoissance de plusieurs memoires tant de la navigation que des terres et grandes richesses qui sont là sans rien toucher aux Espagnolz ny Portugais d'autant que tout ce qui leur pourroit importer en leurs nouvelles conquestes est laissé à droite et à gauche ayant à suivre la droite ligne du Midy après avoir passé l'equinoxe jusques aux dictes terres qui sont riches et opulentes en metaulx precieulx et qui seroyent très fertiles estans cultivées et deffendues de l'autorité et puissance d'un grand Roy comme Vostre Majesté et sans aucune despence que de quelques vaisseaux et hommes inutiles et de vivres comme il y en a habondance en Vostre Royaume où chacun de voz subjectz curieux de l'honneur et proffict y en pourroyent assez ac-

⁴ Sir Humphrey Gilbert.

⁵ The Marquis de la Roche.

⁶ Coligny.

⁷ See note 2 *ante*.

querir. Et davantaige les Cosmographes qui en ont escript et Pilotes qui y ont esté disent que c'est le derriere de la terre ferme pour aller partout le monde et aux Indes Orientales et Occidentales que tiennent les dictz Espagnolz et Portugais. Ilz ont remarqué aussi aux advenementz et premieres entrées quelques captz et embouchures de rivières qui sont bien descouvertz pour y faire les premiers fors et y demeurer en toute seureté et encores que la navigation soit longue s'il y alloit douze navires il en pourroit tous les ans retourner six chargez de marchandises precieuses et riches entre autres de mines d'or comme en ce temps là il me souvient avoir oy dire que une livre et demye rapportoit deulx onces et cela se pourroit faire pendant que les autres demeureroient à la conquête et decouverte des dictes terres et à y establir les loix et polices du Prince que en seroit le conquereur. Les peuples sauvages de ce pays là sont de facile et bonne nature, nudz et desarmez de toutes choses et très faciles à vaincre s'ilz se vouloyent opposer, et pour le peu de connoissance, Sire, que j'en ay tant dudict d'Albaigne que de quelques autres pilotes que aussi de ce que j'en ay apprins en Portugal, oy dire par tous ceulx qui entendent la navigation et remarqué curieusement par la carte et le globe, j'offre à Vostre Majesté le très humble service que je luy pourrois faire en cela et d'y aller quand il luy plaira le me commander avec tous les moyens amys et compagnons que je pourray avoir, et ce pendant j'ay parlé à ung marinier francoys pour l'envoyer avec le dict chevalier Gilbert et m'en rapporter nouvelles. Le dict Gilbert faict à ses propres coustz et de quelques ungs de ses amys et compagnons le dict voyage. Sur ce je prie Dieu, Sire, qu'il vous donne en santé heureuse et longue vie. De Londres etc.

V. To HENRY III. (July 13, 1578.)

Deulx cent neufiesme [*bis*] despesche
du xiii^e juillet 1578.

Au Roy

Sire, . . .

. . . de quoi j'apprendrai ce que je pourray pour en donner advis à Vostre Majesté et de toutes les autres occurrences comme du chevalier Gilbert qui me vient voir plusieurs [fois?] depuis qu'il a eu connoissance que je scavois son desseing. Il part^s avec ung gaillard equippage de trois ou quatre vaisseaulx plus que je n'avois mandé à Vostre Majesté et surtout il ne demandroit querelles ny guerres avec les francois s'il en alloit de ce costé là et qu'ils se rencontrassent sur telles decouvertes où il y a assez de pays pour tous. J'enverray quelques ungs avec lui pour me rapporter nouvelles.

VI. To HENRY III. (October 17, 1578.)

Au Roi.

Deux cent vingt deuxiesme depeschés du
xvii^e jour d'octobre 1578.

Sire . . .

Forbichet est retourné de son voyaige⁹ chargé de mines d'or où l'on dit qu'il y aura grand proffict mayz il fault voir pour espreuver.

⁸ Gilbert did not sail from Dartmouth till Sept. 23, nor from Plymouth till Nov. 18.

⁹ On the return from Frobisher's third voyage, "all the Fleete arrived safely in England about the first of October, some in one place, and some in another" (Hakluyt, ed. 1904, VII. 366).

VII. TO HENRY III. (November 2, 1580.)

Trois cent septiesme despesche du ii^e jour
novembre 1580

Au Roy

Sire, depuis avoir escript a Vostre Majesté j'ay veu la Roynne d'Angleterre vostre bonne seur entierement resolute et disposée à estre vostre belle seur et de parachever le plus tost qu'il sera possible le mariage avec Monseigneur vostre frere¹⁰ et encores que ce soit redire plusieurs fois une mesme chose tout son conseil et ce Royaume ne desirent pour le jourdhuy autre chose avec beaucoup de regret de tout le temps perdu. l'alteration entre ce Royaume et l'Espagne croist tous les jours et avec plus mauvaise intelligence et plus d'inimitié et l'ambassadeur d'Espagne¹¹ n'a point eu encores d'audiance, ce qu'il a prins à grand point d'honneur pour le service et reputation de son maistre vers lequel il a envoyé pour scavoir ce qu'il aura à faire. Et Drac qui a fait ce grand voyage par tout le monde et butin sur les Espaignolz, passé en la mer du sud et le destroit de Magaillanne et escumé toute la coste des Indes Occidentales faisans plusieurs fois grans et riches butins et prinses sur les Espaignolz comme je l'ay escript à Vostre Majesté et comme il avoit repassé aux Indes Orientales, veu et reconnu infinies regions et ysles faciles à conquerer a faict un voiage admirable et faict tel raport de son voiage qu'il promet d'enrichir ce Royaume de telles conquestes et tresors qu'il plaira à la Roynne d'Angleterre, ce qui l'a fait aussi bien voir et recevoir de la dicte dame et de toute l'Angleterre qu'il l'a merité, ce qui a bien haussé et rehaussé le courage à plusieurs de ceste nation, neantmoins il estoit echappé à son arrivée audit Drac et à ceulx qui ont fait le voiage avec luy, de dire que c'estoit un piperie des Espaignolz de dire qu'il y eust tant de difficulté en ce voyage et en la navigation des Indes qu'ilz disoient estre fort facile ayant faict rapport que ceulx qui avoyent voulu dire que le destroit de Magaillanne ne ce repassoit point de la mer Pacifique ny du Perou pour rentrer en l'Ocean sans faire tout le tour des Indes Orientales, Ils c'estoient trompez ou avoyent voulu tromper autrui, disant qu'il n'y avoit point de difficulté à passer et repasser le dict destroit de Magaillanne dont pour en scavoir la verité, il en avoit faict la preuve et qu'il n'avoit trouvé en nulle navigation plus de facilité. Ce qui devoit bien faire croire que les Espaignolz tenoyent ce secret de ceste navigation des Indes caché pour dire que le destroit de Magaillanne estoit perilleux et difficile. Il pense plus tost que ce sont fort belles et plaisantes ysles du costé ostral et vers le pays que les Espaignolz ont nommé la Terre del Fuego que non pas terre ferme qui face le dict destroit de Magaillanne, que le dict Drac estime ce pouvoir passer et repasser à toutes heures plus facilement que celluy de Callais, mays il luy a esté commandé qu'il ne failloit pas qu'il en parlast avec telle facilité ce qui luy a resserré la bouche et à ceulx qui ont fait le voyage avec deffence de n'en parler plus que bien retenu, mays pour en dire sommairement à Vostre Majesté le voyage du dict Drac qui est autant à dire en Angloys que ung canard masle, Il a esté presque d'ung pole à l'autre passé et repassé quatre fois les deux tropicques et la ligne equinoxiale et après avoir passé le destroit de Magaillanne a couru toute la coste du Perou où il a fait plus butins jusques en Panama

¹⁰ François, duke of Anjou.

¹¹ Don Bernardino de Mendoza.

auquel lieu il a prins en une seule barque pour sept centz mil escuz de lingotz d'or et d'argent et de là a couru et fouraigé toutes les costes de la Neufve Espagne et en ung aultre vaisseau en a prins pour trois centz mil escuz et en plusieurs aultres vaisseaulx qui chargeoient pour retourner avec la flotte plus de six centz mil escuz comme il appert et est tesmoingné par les informations et plaintes qu'en fait l'ambassadeur d'Espagne comme luy mesme le m'a dit et les avoir receus du Roy son Maistre et des marchans qui ont fait la perte¹² dont il y en a ung Espaignol à la poursuite lequel m'a dit venant à la messe à mon logis qu'il y estoit en sa part pour plus de troys centz mil escuz et que le dict Drac a prins et ravagé oultre l'or et l'argent plusieurs riches pierreries et sacagé et devalisé toute la pescherye des perles, et après bruslé les vaisseaulx et plusieurs aultres navires de peur d'estre suyvy selon que à peu près sy tost qu'arriva le dict Drac, je le mandiai à Vostre Majesté, lequel néantmoins a esté suyvy deulx mil lieux par quatre navires que le viceroy des Indes du Perou envoya après. Le dict Drac a fait rapport que l'or et l'argent est aussy commun et naturel en plusieurs lieux où il a passé qu'en Angleterre est le plomb et l'estein ayant bon intention d'y retourner avec ce qui luy sera necessaire pour ce voyage et pour y prendre terre s'il plaist à la Royne sa maistresse, ayant aussy fait rapport que les Espaignolz quant ilz seroient cent fois autant qui sont en ce pais là ne seroient pas pour peupler ny habiter la miliesme partye qu'il disent estre de leurs conquestes, mesmes quant toute l'Espagne et le Portugal iroient jusques aux petitz enfans, et en faisant le dict Drac son raport à la Royne d'Angleterre vostre bonne seur, il luy a dict quant elle seroit maryée avec Monseigneur vostre frère et bien aliés avec Vostre Majesté et vostre Royaume, il scavoit les moyens de vous faire les plus grans et puissans monarches et enpereurs de tout le monde, chose où la dicte dame a prins plaisir que le dict Drac luy ayt touché du mariage, luy demandant qui luy en avoit parlé, car il y a deux ans et demy qu'il estoit party, Mays il en avoit esté instruit de quelques ungs luy disant qu'il feroit plaisir à la dicte dame de luy parler de mariage comme elle si plaist fort. . . .

Il¹³ est entierement de la facture du Duc d'Albe et voit bien qu'il aura icy bien petite raison de Drac et du butin qu'il a fait si grand sur les Espaignolz sans le dommage et regret qu'il leur a porté d'avoir faict ce voyage et d'avoir recongneu tant de secretz qui estoient cachez à toutes les autres nations entre lesquelles il ne s'en trouve point qui ayt faict aujourd'hui ce qu'a faict le dit Drac le quel a circonqué tout le monde et passé et repassé quatre fois en son voiage les deux tropiques et la ligne équinoxiale à scavoir de droicte ligne en allant de nostre pole à l'autre et passant vers le Rio de la Plata pour aller passer le destroit de Magaillanne, où après faisant et reconnoissant toute la coste du Perou comme j'ay dict cy dessus a repassé le tropique de Capricorne pour entrer en la mer du su, puis a repassé de ce costé là la ligne equinoxiale et nostre tropique de Cancer en costoyant toute la terre jusques au cinquante et cinquiesme degré pour chercher le destroit de Cataye où il trouva les pais plus froitz et septentrionnaux, accommodant tousjours son voiage au cours du soleil et à la saison

¹² The reader may compare Mendoza's briefs, printed from the Ashmolean MSS. in the Bodleian Library by Mrs. Zelia Nuttall in her *New Light on Drake*, pp. 411-419.

¹³ The Spanish ambassador.

pour se conserver luy et ses gens en santé, Et après a suivy et recogneu toute la coste des Indes Orientales et quelquechose du Royaume de la Chine qui est au mesme parallele que l'Itallye et l'Espagne et le plus beau, plaisant, riche et oppulent climat du monde, et royaume de facile conqueste, dont j'ay veu quelques memoyres et secretz et semblablement de Cambaye¹⁴ et ce qui en a esté proposé au feu Roy Don Sébastien de Portugal lorsqu'il alla en Affricque où il mourut d'où s'il fust retourné il vouloit faire l'entreprise, lequel quant il vouloit recompenser un serviteur de quelque grand bien, il lui donnoit une licence et permission de passer à leschine¹⁵ avec un seul navire ce qui valloit tousjours environ deulx centz mil escutz de proffit, n'estant pas le gain moindre de mil et deux mil pour cent, mays pour achever de dire à Vostre Majesté, Sire, le voiage du dict Drac esperant qu'elle n'y prendra que plaisir comme estant un maistre canart, Il a retourné par l'ysle de Japan où il y a sept roys fort riches et si fait un traficque ordinaire du royaume de leschine d'or, d'argent, riches et belles manufactures puis en continuant son voyage il a reconnu les Indes Orientales que l'on appelle aujourd'hui celles des Portugues pour y avoir iceulx fait par cy et par là plusieurs conquestes legeres, puis ledict Drac a reconnu beaucoup de belles ysles adjacentes voisines escartées, ayant fait rapport que les dictz Portugues sont trop foibles et en petit nombre pour faire de telles conquestes et quant ils les pourroient faire ilz n'auroient pas de quoy les peupler et maintenir. Ce sont entreprises, Sire, d'un prince oppulant de toutes sortes d'hommes vivres et munitions comme Vostre Majesté qui ce peult faire et rendre par mer et par la navigation plus grand que nul roy qui l'ause entreprendre car vous avez en France toutes les commoditez hommes et mariniers qui s'accommoderoient à toutes choses et aux quelz ilz ne faudroit point d'argent et s'ilz ce mettoient une fois en l'esprit d'en aller aquerir et du bien et de l'honneur hors de la France avec le commandement et bonne volonté de Vostre Majesté vous ne verriez jamais de guerres civiles en vostre royaume lesquelles ne naissent que d'oysiveté et de n'avoir que faire en autre lieu, Mais tous voz subjects seroyent heureux et pleins de richesses, et pour dire à Vostre Majesté jusques à la fin du voyage de Drac, il a repassé du costé des Indes Orientales pour le troisieme fois le tropic de Canser et la ligne equinoxiale soubz la quelle il a veu et recongneu plusieurs belles, grandes, riches et petites ysles entre lesquelles il a repassé comme en un autre destroit entre Malaca et Sumatra que les entiens appelloient la Taprobane¹⁶ puis est retourné passer le tropic de Capricorne en l'ysle de St. Lorens¹⁷ pour gagner le cap de Bonne Esperance, puis a encores comme l'on dict veu quelques unes des terres australes et meridionales qui ne sont descouvertes desquelles un nommé Francisque d'Albaigne avoit proposé les conquestes au feu Roy vostre frère, à Vostre Majesté et à la Royne vostre mère, sans rien entreprendre sur celles des Espaignolz et Portugues. Il y a esdictes terres et conquestes australes et meridionales, infinis royaumes et empires plus grandz que toute l'Europe et de mesme temperature, puis le dict Drac ce retournant au pole meridional pour regagner le nostre a repassé soubz le tropicque de Capricorne pour la quatrieme

¹⁴ Apparently Cambay in India.

¹⁵ La Chine.

¹⁶ The Taprobane of the ancients was Ceylon, not Sumatra.

¹⁷ Madagascar.

foys pour rentrer en l'Océan reconnoissant en quelques endroitz de tous costez plusieurs terres et ysles, puis a repassé pour la quatriesme fois soubz la ligne equinoxiale pour rentrer en la mer du Nort et de là a repassé le tropic de Cancer en reconnoissant le plus court chemin de la navigation des Espagnolz pour aller à leurs Indes et à Nombre de Dios et leur Neufve Espagne et à la Floride et de là est retourné heureusement en Angleterre avec tout son butin ayant passé et repassé comme je l'ay icy deduit à Vostre Majesté, quatre fois les deux tropiques et la ligne equinoxiale et esté d'une Inde à l'autre et circonqué tout le monde d'un pole à l'autre en ce qui est naviguable. Voyla, Sire, un petit sommaire du voyage dudict Drac qui a eu autant d'honneur et de faveur de la Roïne sa maistresse et de tout son conseil et en ce Royaume que l'ambassadeur d'Espagne a voulu rechercher de ce plaindre de luy ce que voyant n'avoir peu faire jusques icy et que les audiences luy ont esté refusées est resolu de n'en demander plus aucune quant bien l'on la luy voudroit donner, qu'il n'ayt la responce du Roy son maistre sur le refus qui luy a esté faict. Neantmoins il y a quelques ungs qui discourent et disent estre bien asseurez que le dict Roy d'Espagne sera bien ayse de passer doucement toutes choses avec ceste princesse comme plusieurs autres mauvaises intelligences qui sont survenues auparavant avec d'autres ambassadeurs dudict Espagne qui ont esté mal traictez et avec quelques prinses d'argent des Espagnolz qui ont esté faictes pardeca, et encores s'excusera volontiers le dict Roy d'Espagne de la desente faicte en Yr[l]ande¹⁸ disant qu'il ne sera pas cause et si remettra en la volonté et consideration de la dicte Roïne de faire telle raison qu'elle jugera raisonnable dudict Drac, ne voulant le dict Roy d'Espagne rien alterer avec elle ny ce Royaume s'il peult pour crainte qu'il a qu'elle ne face l'amitié estroicte avec Vostre Majesté et que cela ne luy empesche ces desseins tant en Portugal que aillieurs. . . .

VIII. To HENRY III. (April 9, 1581.)

Trois cens vingt deuxiesme depesche du
neufiesme jour d'apvril 1581.

Au Roi.

Sire, . . .

Le lendemain apres que la dicte dame eut receu la response de monseigneur vostre frere par le Sieur de Nery et l'eut enquiz semblablement le Sieur de Marchaumont qui l'avoit despechée de tout ce qui pouvoit la contenter elle s'en alla disner où estoit le navire de Drac celluy que j'ay mandé à Vostre Majesté qui avoit faict tout le tour de la terre et faict ses grandes entreprinses sur les Espagnolz et aux Indes occidentalles et passant la dicte Roïne sur la rivièrre par devant mon logis m'envoya convier de prendre ung disner de marrine les dicts Sieurs de Marchaumont et de Nery estant desja avec elle dès le matin. nous arrivasmes au lieu où estoit le dicte navire à deux lieues et demys de Londre où le disner estoit préparé en une petite maison là auprès où se font les grands vaisseaux d'Angleterre où la dicte dame estoit fort allaigne et contante faisant les excuses du mauvais traitement en me faisant connoistre et deviner moyennant de bonnes parolles qu'elle

¹⁸ By the expedition of 1579 under James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald, allowed by King Philip to depart from Spain.

se sentoit infiniment tenue et obligée à Vostre Majesté et à Monseigneur vostre frere et qu'en nulle chose qui dependist de sa puissance elle ne manqueroit de vous faire connoistre qu'elle aymoît Vostre Majesté bien et prosperité en toutes choses comme le sien et ainsi il ce fyst un disner où la dicte dame ne monstra point de melancollie luy estant faits plusieurs presents par le dict Drac avec la carte de tout son voiage et de plusieurs sortes de poissons depeints en un grand parchemin qui ne se trouvent en ses [ces] mers de desà et monstra quelques garçons habillez à l'indienne qui danserent à la facon du pais combien que se fussent des garçons anglois qui avoient faict le voyage avec luy et environ sur les deux heures la dicte Royne alla au navire de Drac qui est tout mangé de vers comme sont communement tous les vaisseaux qui font le voyage des Indes et sont deux ans sans retourner comme cestuy cy a esté deux ans et dix moys le dicte navire estant considéré et en icelluy discours de plusieurs choses de la marine où il y avoit plusieurs bons cappitaines mesmement le cappitaine Forbichet qui a par deux foys entrepris de trouver par le costé du nort le destroit de Cataye lequel il m'asseura encores du profict que la dicte Royne trouveroit si par mesme moyen acoursiroit les deux tiers du chemin pour aller aux Indes Occidentales et au Perou et par mesme moyen en tout l'orient maiz il dict qu'il n'a jamais bien commencé son voyage pour le temps comme il espere de faire une autre foys et aussi qu'il s'estoit amusé à rechercher des mines d'or dont le profit seroit petit parce que la despense y est trop grande puis le dict Drac a faict plusieurs beaux discours de son voyage mais le meilleur point, Sire, est qu'il en a raporté dix huit cent mil escuz de lingotz d'or et d'argent qu'ilz appellent Barres marquez à la marque du Roy d'Espagne et de ses subjects comme l'ambassadeur d'Espagne m'en a souvent assuré et discours assez particulièrement ensemble du desplaisir et sentiment qu'en avoit son maystre jusques à me dire aussi que le Roy son maystre avoit neuf millions pour en demander deux aux Angloys mais aulcun n'a jusques à present esté ouy ny escouté sy elle ne l'a ouy par advertissement de leur malcontentement lesquels toutefois ils ont dyssimullez jusques à ceste heure pensant de se racommoder et ne perdre ceste amitié et que croient que la dicte Royne qui a mis les mains sur la meilleure part de ce qu'a aporté le dict Drac en feroit faire quelque restitution et monstreroit au moins quelque forme de justice et de ne favoriser sy apertement et aprouver ce qu'a faict le dict Drac qui est après avoir demeuré quatre grandes heures en son navire et [ouy?] du dict voyage de ce qui estoit de la conquête des espagnolz et des portugues de leurs richesses et tresors en sez pais là de ceulx qui leur sont favorables et ennemys et les vouldroyent voir hors de là avec qui ilz ont commencé à intelliger ce qu'ilz ont desja d'entiere possession et ce qu'ilz est facile de subjurer et acquerir par la force et par les armes et combien il y a d'empires et de monarchies où les princes chrestiens peuvent prendre aussy honnestement que les princes espagnols ce qui donna un goust et une envye tant à la dicte Royne qu'à ceux qui en oyent parler et qui consideroient leur grandeur et richesses qui peuvent venir de ce costé là aux princes qui en vouldroyent avoir l'avantage aussy bien que les espagnols. Sur sce discours de quatre heures et qu'il commençoit à faire tard la dicte Royne a commandé que pour une memoyre à la posterité le navire du dict Drac fust mené en ung lieu à

couvert et conservé tant qu'il y auroit une piece de boys avec l'honneur au Cappitaine et à ceux qui ont fait le voyage et au boys qui aura portez et raportez, puis la Royne en soubriant ma demandé si je ne voulois pas bien prester mon espée pour luy couper la teste et ainsi la prinst, encores que luy en ayt esté offerte une autre, pour le faire Chevalier avec beaucoup d'honneur qu'a reçu le dict Drac et parce qu'il estoit pauvre soldat de grande vertu et venu de petite maison obscure la dicte Royne luy a donné des armoyries où sont les deux polles en forme de deux estoilles au deux boutz d'une sphere et choses bien raportées à l'entreprinse heureuse de son grand voyage de sorte que ce jour là c'est passé bien à faire honneur au dict Drac et à monstrar une aprobaton de tout ce qu'il a fait où quelques uns en cour font des discours que la dicte Royne tasche par tous les moyens qu'elle peult de donner à connoistre que la France et l'Angleterre ne sont qu'une mesme chose. . . .

Par apostille.

Sire, encores n'obmettray-je de dire à Vostre Majesté que j'ay fait une grande amitié avec le dict Drac que me dist dernieremen, estant à disner à mon logis, qu'il me bailleroit sa carte et le discours de tout son voyage et sy Monseigneur Vostre Frere estoit son roy et vostre royaume en amitié avec cestuy-cy, il scavoit assez de moyens pour agrandir vostre royaume, quant vous seriez uniz ensemble, me disant aussi le dict Drac qu'il scavoit des moyens de trouver tant de richesses et tresors que l'on n'en scauroit que faire, et me dist un discours que luy, estant un pauvre soldat angloys, s'il avoit pour son particullier voullu accepter ce qui c'estoit offert en sa fortune, il seroit à ceste heure roy et grand prince et ne toucheroit des pieds en terre, qui est à dire que les peuples et subjectz qui prennent un roy ou seigneur le portent de leurs mains ou en des chaiss ou sieges excellens partout où il luy plaist d'aller, le reverant comme un Dieu, mays, se souvenant qu'il estoit un pauvre angloys, bon et fidelle subject de sa Reyne, il ne veult jamais avoir bien ny honneur que celluy qu'elle luy donnera, et employer sa vye et tous ses labeurs à rehaulser sa grandeur et apporter commodité à sa patrie, disant aussi que c'est pitié de la domination des Espagnols dans ce pais là avec sy peu de gens et que, sy le roy d'Espagne n'est empesché des conquestes, qu'il pourra faire pardelà mesme-ment des Indes Oriantales il aura tant de tresors or et argen qu'il en pourra conquerir tout le monde. Le dict Drac est homme petit et qui a fort bonne grace, qui parle peu et fort à propos et a bien la mine de faire plus qu'il ne dit. Il m'a aussi compté qu'il a esté toute sa vye heureux sur la mer et en ses voyages; et un jour l'ambassadeur d'Espagne le trouva à mon logis qui en fut bien estonné et ce retira comme ne le voulant point voir, et apres que le dict Drac fut party le dict ambassadeur dist qu'il l'estimoit un bon larron et qu'il y a un proverbe en espagne qui dit que les larrons petits estoyent les plus fines et plus aysez à cacher en peu de lieu et que l'on fait son gloire et miracle en Angleterre d'y voir un pirate de qui sy le Roy d'Espagne donnoit congé à ses sujetz de desrober sur la mer comme il ne l'avoit jamais fait il se trouveroit d'aussy bons pirates et larrons en Espagne qu'en lieu du monde et qu'il y avoit quatre ans que les Anglois n'avoient eu de guerre contre l'Espagne de qui s'ils en venoyent là ils sentiroient

combien ils avoyent la main pesante et plusieurs autres discours comme d'un ambassadeur tres mal contant de l'Angleterre et tres affectionné au service de son maistre qui luy en a faict aussy bonne escompte. . . .

[In return for great labors and expenditures the writer would like] recepvoir quelque bien faict de Vostre Majesté et le payement de ce qui m'est deub, comme il luy a pleu de le me promettre au commencement de ceste année, affin que reprenne nouveau courage et nouvelles forces pour faire service à Vostre Majesté, lui offrant de faire le mesme voyage de Drac et plus s'il est possible pour aller planter voz fleurs de lis et vostre nom en lieu d'où il vous reviendra grand honneur et profit, et en attendant je supplierai Dieu, etc.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The New History and the Social Studies. By HARRY ELMER BARNES, Ph.D., Professor of Historical Sociology in Smith College and Professor of Social and Economic Institutions in Amherst College. (New York: Century Company. 1925. Pp. xix, 605. \$4.00.)

SINCE receiving his degree in 1918, Dr. H. E. Barnes has displayed remarkable activity in literary production, and, while history seems to have been and to remain his major interest, his writings have been marked throughout by disapprobation of the accepted forms of procedure in this field. It may, therefore, be of interest to examine the present volume with a view to determining the source of the anti-historical polemic of one of the younger generation of college teachers.

The term "new history", which Dr. Barnes brings into the foreground, suggests at once *The New History* which James Harvey Robinson published in 1912. With this earlier book in mind, one is not surprised to find the later volume dedicated "To the 'Columbia School' of historians of a decade ago"; to find that of the eight portraits in the book five are those of Columbia professors; or to find that various courses at the same university are mentioned with enthusiasm (pp. 38, 207, 286, etc.). Having observed this predisposition one is led to notice the author's statement that the views expressed in chapter I., devoted specifically to the "new history", "were drawn primarily from the writer's experiences and instruction while a graduate student at Columbia University" (p. xi). One's attention is attracted further by the author's recognition that he has had "unusual advantages in the way of teachers" (p. x), and, as expressing his attitude to one of these in particular, by his remark that "it is the calm and deliberate judgment of the writer that no book by an historian can be said to equal *The Mind in the Making* as a presentation of the more significant generalizations of history" (p. 208). These observations confirm the general impression gained from reading Dr. Barnes's volume that what he has undertaken is not an exposition of results arrived at by independent inquiry, but an indoctrination of views derived from courses of instruction under admired teachers.

The immediate effect of the author's reliance upon the instruction he has received finds expression in a well-defined confidence, assurance, and satisfaction in dealing with the vexed problems of historiography. Thus he is positive that the work of those with whom he does not agree is "pretentious", "superficial", "arbitrary", "mischievous", "obstructive", "archaic", "anachronistic", "preposterous", "puerile", "fan-

tastic", "grotesque", "vicious", and "absurd". He is of opinion that many of the most important of the "conventional" historians of the nineteenth century have an "unfortunate misconception of the nature and purpose of history" (pp. 4, 5); that the procedure of "alleged" historians is "an unpardonable intrusion upon the domain of the science of government" (p. 10); and that "conventional historiography" "has a fundamental psychological basis in the notorious simian tendency of mankind to be attracted by the superficial, the sensational, and the scandalous" (p. 6).

Another consequence of the author's confidence in his teachers may be observed from the way in which he has converted a mannerism of instruction into a characteristic of literary style. The practice, not infrequently developed in oral instruction, of running off lists of names without attention either to alphabet or chronology, is a somewhat dangerous expedient when employed as a basis for the study of the relationship of the successive contributors to a given theory or technique. Dr. Barnes has cultivated a marked predilection for lists of surnames, without adopting the precaution of accompanying his references with the dates of publications (an extended count shows that about eighty per cent. of the citations in this book are without dates). The inevitable result of this practice may be seen in the author's statement that "Due to the labors of such students of geography as Vidal de la Blache, Mackinder, Kretschmer, Partsch, Goetz, and others, the historians of France, England, and Germany, such as Michelet, Green, Riehl, and their successors, have been able to found their interpretation of national cultural evolution on an adequate comprehension of the geographic setting of this process" (p. 291)—that a later generation should have such an important influence upon an earlier one would not readily occur to one who was in the habit of paying some attention to bibliographical detail.

The most important result of Dr. Barnes's experiences and instruction at Columbia University is to be seen, however, in his proposal to combine the "new history" of James Harvey Robinson with the anthropology of Franz Boas and the sociology of F. H. Giddings. The product of the influences to which the author has been exposed is expressed definitely in the opinion that "the present type of history, instead of attempting to explain the origin, nature, and developments of *the* state, simply recites the most striking episodes connected with the history of some *particular* state or group of states" (p. 9, author's italics). This is the fundamental issue of the book. Briefly, it means that Dr. Barnes insists that a return be made to the "theoretical" or "ideal" history of the eighteenth century, which is represented in the "generalized" series of the "comparative method" (cf. pp. 276, 277, 284, 315, 329, etc.), and which is expounded systematically in the sociology of Auguste Comte. Against this particular type of "synthetic" construction, historians reacted at the beginning of the nineteenth century; in opposition to it, they have maintained for a century the validity and necessity of the study of the history of particular

peoples, states, and countries. Should they surrender this point of view all that would remain for them would be to follow Dr. Barnes's recommendations and undertake, by constructing a complete picture of the entire past (p. 17), "to grasp and describe the whole current of human progress" (p. 7), to discover "the nature and course of human development" with "the probable future development and the real goal of the human race" (p. 21), to determine "the true nature of social evolution" (p. 22), "to survey the history of human culture as a unity" (p. 286), to devote themselves to "the production of illuminating generalizations concerning human development" (p. 341).

A century ago historical scholars succeeded in freeing themselves from the illusions of "synthetic" history, and thus took the first step towards a strictly scientific study of the human past. Since that time, however, despite the stimulus of the advances made in every other type of investigation, they have assumed that no further effort on their part was required, and have adhered to the destructive doctrine that the historian is not concerned with the theoretical aspects of his study. The results of this policy are to be seen in the impatience and dissatisfaction manifested on all sides with the present condition of history as an academic subject, and in the renewed assaults of what Professor Emerton not improperly described as the "ancient enemy" (*cf.* p. 319). This book is simply one more evidence of the imperative necessity that those who represent the study of history in its accepted form should make the intellectual effort required to meet the present situation.

FREDERICK J. TEGGART.

A History of Agriculture in Europe and America. By NORMAN SCOTT BRIEN GRAS, Professor of Economic History in the University of Minnesota. (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1925. Pp. xxvii, 444. \$3.50.)

AGRICULTURAL history is always an interesting subject; the author's style and treatment make it fascinating, without sacrificing scholarship. He has made wide use of what historians commonly regard as primary sources, though documentary sources are, from the economist's standpoint, always secondary, his own observation and experience alone being primary sources. This book is a product of library scholarship at its best. Its weaknesses, which are of a minor sort, grow out of a lack of first-hand knowledge of agriculture as it is at the present time.

Very naturally it emphasizes the social, political, and institutional rather than the technical sides of agriculture. Very little is said about the structure and development of farm implements, the kinds of power used in farm work, ways of yoking oxen (a fascinating subject), or the technique of the plow.

In his discussion of the economic stages the author follows the German pattern in the main, though he has added (page 31), on his own initiative,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—20.

a new stage which he calls "legume rotation". He might have added still another, namely, the "indoor stage", which is quite as important as some that he has included.

It seems to the reviewer that he labors overhard to fit the facts into the established framework of so-called economic stages. This seems especially true in his treatment of American agriculture. It would not be difficult to find, in any decade of our agricultural history, a great many facts that would fit into any of the stereotyped stages of agricultural development, from the most primitive to the most advanced. It requires great care and wide information, which is ordinarily not attainable, to determine which group of facts is dominant or which really characterizes the agriculture of any given period.

There are excellent chapters on Roman Agrarian History, the Medieval Manor, Peasant Revolts, Enclosures in England, and the Agricultural Revolution, chiefly in England. The least satisfactory chapters are on Metropolitan and National Economy in England: The Economics and Politics of Modern Agriculture, on the History of Property in Land, and on Stages in American Agriculture. The first of these three seems a little stilted, or at least to lay too much emphasis on a purely academic classification. The second contains an excellent description of the principal forms of land tenure, but is rather vague as to what property in land really is; in fact it does not improve much on the ordinary legal jargon. The third leaves the reader somewhat puzzled as to what the stages in American agriculture really were. There seems to be a Germanesque emphasis on the genetic or evolutionary rather than on the historical stages, and even these genetic stages seem to have a way of getting mixed. And yet, American agriculture has passed through at least four rather definite stages to which approximate dates may be assigned.

The author accepts the current doctrine that slavery in the South was rooted in local conditions. In the rice and indigo plantations of the far South, African slaves were doubtless an economic necessity. There is not the slightest reason for believing that they were better adapted to the agriculture of Virginia and North Carolina than to that of New York or Pennsylvania, or that tobacco and cotton needed slave labor more than corn and wheat, as corn and wheat were grown before the period of agricultural machinery. The liberal land policy of Virginia probably had more to do with the introduction and spread of slavery than the physical conditions or the kinds of crops grown. So long as any freeman could become a landowner it was impossible to hold free labor at any wage that a farmer could afford to pay. Indentured servants could be held for three years but no longer. There really was no permanent labor supply where land was free. African slaves solved the problem for those who wanted a permanent supply.

After the problem was thus solved, the plantation system became an economic possibility. From a condition where there was no dependable labor supply at all, there was a change to a condition where there was an

abundant and a permanent supply of very cheap labor. It now became possible to employ in agriculture vast funds of labor under one management, a thing which is economically impossible when labor is scarce, transient, and dear. Rice and indigo plantations were made possible by the fact of African slavery. African slavery did not come into existence because of the rice and indigo plantations.

The book is on the whole so excellent that the reviewer regrets that the author chose to throw in an occasional and wholly unnecessary cynical remark. Two samples will suffice, though there are many. After comparing (page 301) England's need for wheat and cotton during our Civil War, he says: "The large (wheat) crop of the North was a material bribe to England to throw its influence into the scale on behalf of human liberty." Again (page 344), in comparing the Italian immigrants of New Jersey with the poor whites of Georgia to the disadvantage of the latter, he remarks: "These hardy denizens of the wilderness fought long and fiercely in the Civil War to maintain slavery, to perpetuate a system which gave to them the only prestige they were ever likely to possess." If there is anything that is clear it is that slavery lowered the prestige of all those who had to do the kind of work that slaves ordinarily did. They were induced to fight precisely because they were persuaded by the dominant class that they were fighting not in defense of slavery but in defense of their states against the encroachments of the federal government.

The book is provided with an analytical table of contents, an excellent and elaborate index, and abundant marginal headings. Notes and references are grouped at the end of each chapter instead of at the bottom of each page. There is also, at the end of each chapter, a large and varied list of "Suggestions for Further Study".

T. N. CARVER.

La Perse Antique et la Civilisation Iranienne. Par CLÉMENT HU-ART, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur à l'École Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes, Directeur d'Études à l'École des Hautes Études. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, ed. Henri Berr, no. 24.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1925. Pp. xv, 295. 20 fr.)

THIS interesting series makes swift and admirable progress, and the savants who are producing volume after volume rank safely beyond dispute among the masters in their several fields. But as in every other series there are uneven places, so also in this, for the best man is not always obtainable. This present volume greatly outranks many others, for than M. Clément Huart it were quite impossible to discover in all of learned France a scholar better fitted to cope successfully with a task so complicated or so difficult. The difficulty is largely to be sought and most surely found in the extent of the field, for this small volume covers histories and civilizations which begin with the earliest movements of

the peoples afterwards known as Medes in prehistoric time and Persians, and end only with Chosroes in 728-729 A.D. In this long period the mixture of peoples was served by three systems of writing: (1) the cuneiform employed by the Achaemenian kings, (2) the Pahlavi of the Arsacides, and of the Avestan commentaries, and (3) the Avestan (Zend) in which the Avesta is written. The field is too wide for equally authoritative mastery in every portion by one man, and this very excellent book is certainly not of equal authority in all its parts. Disclaiming all right to a valid decision on the period much later than that of Alexander the Great, I may be allowed to say that the book is hardly at the top of sure decision all the way through the earlier part. Strange though this may sound at first, it lacks most in its use of the Greek authorities which seem to me to be yet in need of a more perfect balancing and sifting.

The book is of amazingly wide scope. Here are chapters on Physical Geography; Persian Writing; Empire of the Medes; the Achaemenians; on the organization of their empire, their religion, and art; on Persia under Hellenic influence; the religion of the Arsacides; and their art; on the Sassanians, the organization of their empire, and their religion, and art. The bibliography is superbly done and by a very skillful and practical plan almost every page has its references to authorities without the danger of any seeming overload of documentation. Nothing of high importance available when the book was written seems to have escaped notice. It would, if possible, have been very useful to take note of the important discussion of a part of the march of Alexander the Great by A. F. von Stahl (*Geographical Journal*, Oct., 1924, pp. 312 ff.) with its novel, and to me convincing, proposals concerning that historic expedition. Readers of this book would do well to make note of this. Americans may take a not ignoble pride in marking the use made of the work of their own most distinguished scholar A. V. Williams Jackson.

It is indeed a pleasure to chronicle a book of such distinction, so characteristically French in its clarity and its logical march from beginning to end. That this can be presented at a cost of twenty francs, at low exchange, is a marvel not to be understood among us.

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

Griechische Geschichte im Rahmen der Altertumsgeschichte. By ULRICH WILCKEN. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1924. Pp. vi, 246. 4 M.)

THIS masterly written book is divided into twelve chapters: 1. Primitive Times. 2. Mycenaean Period. 3. Period of Migrations. 4. The Greek Middle Age. 5. Period of Transition. 6. Wars for Freedom. 7. The Hegemony of Athens. 8. The Peloponnesian War. 9. Culture of the V. Century. 10. The Period of Persian Pressure. 11. Alexander the Great. 12. The Hellenistic Period.

The very title indicates that Professor Wilcken is approaching the study of Greek history from an unusual viewpoint. He attempts not only to describe the development of Greek civilization but also to place that civilization in its proper historical setting. He accomplishes this purpose by skillfully linking the "ancient" history of Greece both to its past and to its future. After a short but adequate sketch of the principal cultural and political factors in the development of the countries of the ancient Near East, he bridges the gap between this history and the early period of Greek history by an exceedingly able discussion of the Cretan civilization and of the migrations, in which the previous contacts and later influences are clearly described. Just as the history of the nations of the Near East serves to place Greece in relation to the past, so the history of the Hellenistic period links the history of Greece with its future. This broader treatment of Greek history in which Greece is placed in its proper historical setting as one of the great countries of the ancient Mediterranean fully justifies and gives significance to the title "*Griechische Geschichte im Rahmen der Altertumsgeschichte*".

To Wilcken history is a synthesis of all factors, foreign as well as native, which shape the development of a people. He does not fall into the error of thinking that the cultural achievements of the Greeks are an absolutely pure product; while he admits that the Greeks themselves created the best in their civilization, yet he is not unaware of the influences exerted by other nations on Greece (p. 1). In other words he knows that no people or nation in the world can keep apart entirely from environmental influences and thus secure absolute freedom from contamination.

By stressing the political and cultural history (though in a very limited scope) of the Egyptians and other Oriental nations Wilcken seems to have hinted, that in dealing with Greek history he will dwell more extensively upon these two factors. And in fact there is hardly a chapter to be found in which a section is not devoted to this specific purpose. Ample space is also given to economic history, especially to the economic history of the Hellenistic period.

The author has not only fully mastered the sources but also he employs all the results of recent historical research, for instance the papyri, inscriptions and excavations, etc. Besides the readableness of the book is enhanced by parallels and comparisons drawn from modern history (compare p. 77, where the question of the Helots which was constantly vexing Sparta is compared with the Irish question vexing England, and p. 209, where the consequences of the conquest of Egypt by Alexander for the economic development of the ancient world are compared with the consequences the discovery of America exerted upon Europe).

While treating so broadly the political, cultural, and economic factors in Greek history Wilcken nevertheless succeeds in giving in 246 pages a complete history of Greece. This is due to his conciseness of style as well as to the fact that he not only knows how to deal with space but also prefers to say *multum* not *multa*. This manifests itself in his sketches of great historical personalities.

But the harmonious division of the subject as a whole seems to me to be marred by chapter X., entitled the Period of Persian Pressure. On the one hand this title by no means does justice to the content of the chapter and on the other it is misleading, since besides what Wilcken calls "Persian Pressure" the hegemony of Thebes and the rise and advancement of Macedonia to Philip's death are discussed. Further, it seems to me that to apply the term "Persian Pressure" means to over-emphasize the importance of this pressure, since Persia after the "King's Peace" was in such a weak condition that both Sparta and Athens were by no means mute spectators to this weakness, but added oil to the fires breaking out in Persia by assisting different satraps and dynasts who rebelled against the Great King. (We must recall that the King's Peace was concluded not because Persia was powerful enough to impose this humiliating peace, but rather because the Greek states, though far from being powerless, were in a state of constant discord and disunion.) The same weakness of Persia is seen in the case of Egypt, which also was in the throes of a rebellion against the king; here we find Chabrias and Agesilaus fighting on the Egyptian side against the Persians. The term "pressure" would then, to my mind, fit Macedonia better than Persia, if we take into consideration Philip's achievements as compared with those of Persia.

What one misses in the book is maps, plans, and above all an index. But taking into consideration the high value of the book as a model both of method and scholarship this is a minor defect. One could wish that this excellent book might be translated into English as soon as possible in order to secure for it a larger circle of readers.

JACOB HAMMER.

The Roman Colonate: the Theories of its Origin. By ROTH CLAUSING, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Economics in the University of Rochester. With an Introduction by Vladimir G. Simkhovitch, Professor of Economic History in Columbia University. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CXVII., no. 1.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1925. Pp. 333. \$3.50.)

IN the preface to the book which has been written by Professor V. G. Simkhovitch the contribution of Clausing is praised as "the only comprehensive and up-to-date treatise on the colonate". I am very sorry that I am not able to share the opinion of Mr. Simkhovitch. The book unfortunately though very long is not comprehensive and not up-to-date as regards either the sources or the modern contributions to the problem. It is one of those books of history which are written by dilettanti, especially economists, without sufficient knowledge of the ancient languages and without a good historical training. Therefore I regard the book, in spite of the most strenuous endeavors of the author, as an attempt at solving one of

the most interesting problems of ancient history with quite inadequate means.

Let me produce some scattered remarks on the book which prove my general statement. In the survey of the older theories on the origin of the colonate the author says (in his preface) that no such survey has been made since Heisterbergk (1876). This is misleading. In a series of excellent articles G. Segrè, the famous Italian jurist, gave in the *Archivio Giuridico* (1888–1891) a much better survey than either Heisterbergk or Clausing, and a little later a Russian historian, Ivan Greaves, gave a still better one (his book and articles were, *e.g.*, known to Salvioli and should be familiar to Simkhovitch). As regards the most recent treatments of the problem the author is not up-to-date. He has not used, *e.g.*, the comprehensive articles of E. Kornemann in the last supplement to Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopaedie* (arts. Bauernstand and Domänen) with a good up-to-date bibliography, nor the most recent books and pamphlets written on the decay of ancient civilization (*e.g.*, Heitland, Ferrero, Kornemann, W. Otto, etc., quoted, *e.g.*, in W. Otto, *Kulturgeschichte des Altertums*, 1925, p. 155), nor the interesting book of A. Dopsch, *Wirtschaftliche und Soziale Grundlagen der Europäischen Kulturentwicklung*, I., second ed. (1923), to quote merely the most striking instances.

Still poorer is his information on the sources, especially the inscriptions and the papyri. For them the author relies entirely upon antiquated collections and editions, especially as regards the inscriptions. He still quotes, *e.g.*, Orelli instead of Dessau, or the text of the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander in the first edition of 1828 though the text has been thoroughly modified by later editors, especially Dittenberger and Wilcken. This is not irrelevant, as it shows the incapacity of the author to collect material by himself and therefore "critically to examine the sources". The first requirement for the historian is to use the sources in their most correct form and to present a correct text of them. How little he is informed on the new evidence which is constantly increased by new discoveries is shown by the fact that he has never heard of the new inscriptions bearing on the colonate which have been recently discovered in Asia Minor by Keil and Premerstein, and that for the papyri he used the collection of evidence which was presented by myself fifteen years ago while hundreds of papyri bearing on the subject have been discovered since and many valuable articles have been written to explain the documents which bear on the land question (*e.g.*, Wilcken, Bell, etc.).

I have suggested that his knowledge of both Latin and Greek is poor. I have of course not verified all his translations but such instances as the discovery of a land Picentia (read Picenum), or of a man Cluentus (quoted twice) for whom Cicero wrote one of his speeches (read Cluentius), or the translation of the well-known passage of Pliny where he speaks of the *penuria colonorum* (want or scarcity of tenants) as "the poverty of the tenants", which he uses as a proof of the exhaustion of the soil in Italy, as well as the deplorable shape in which the Greek quotations

are printed, show that the author is not very well equipped for dealing with Greek and Latin sources.

A few words on his theory of the origin of the colonate. He accepts the views expressed by Simkhovitch and repeats most of the arguments of the latter, adding a few of his own. It is striking to note that he never quotes the articles of many German scholars who support the same view. The theory of Simkhovitch is well known. He suggests that the decay of ancient civilization was due to economic reasons, which in their turn were caused by a complete exhaustion of the soil in all the parts of the Roman Empire. This view, to my mind, is completely wrong. In some parts of Italy and Greece the soil may have been exhausted. But it is not true of Egypt nor of many if not most of the other provinces. In Italy at least it was due not to natural causes but, as Columella says, to the neglect of scientific agriculture and to the return to very primitive methods of cultivating the land. Thus not the soil was to blame for the economic decay, but the men. And we must first investigate why men did not make full use of the devices of scientific agriculture. If so the "exhaustion of the soil" becomes not the *cause* of the decay of ancient civilization but one of its symptoms like so many others in the social, economic, and intellectual life of the Roman Empire. I have no space for dealing here with this problem. I refer to my forthcoming book, *The Roman Empire: Social and Economic Development* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926).

M. ROSTOVITZEFF.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Life in Mediaeval France. By JOAN EVANS, B.Litt. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. 234. Map. 15 s.)

"MEDIAEVAL history", the author thinks, "is like a great tapestry, on which many figures—some splendid, some humble, some sinister, and some beautiful—appear against a shadowy background." She aims to describe this background.

Her first chapter is certainly very bad. Entitled "France in the Early Middle Ages" though the period chiefly in view is the ninth to the thirteenth centuries, it is literally strewn with naïveties. "The many political divisions of France after the death of Charlemagne", while "of considerable importance for its political history", are of but secondary interest "for the growth of its mediaeval civilization"; to follow this one has only to perceive four groupings: "Provence in the south [apparently almost all the south], Burgundy in the east, the Ile de France in central France, and Normandy in the north-west." This huge simplification accomplished, others come as a matter of course. For instance, "The *Pax Dei* and the *Pactum Pacis* . . . characteristic of Southern France . . . were the first expression of that almost Hellenic feeling for the gentler side of life, that wish, not for strength alone, but for strength allied with

grace, which Provence shared with Greece". For another instance: how law and theology, or lawyers and clergy, helped the monarchy—"Intellectual argument has flourished in the atmosphere of Paris at least since the time of Julian the Apostate, and intellectual argument kept the idea of sovereignty alive".

The succeeding chapters are at least much better. They treat special aspects of the background—feudal society, town life, monastic life, pilgrimage and crusade, learning, education, work and religion,—and "The End of the Middle Ages". The author has evidently cultivated medieval literature and art, read at least some of the better modern works about France in that time, listened to suggestive teachers, and digested part of her acquisitions. So she is able to say many true things, and sometimes in a striking or living way.

But unfortunately Miss Evans ventures to speak on many more matters than she knows competently. And the naïveties, though less than in the first chapter, keep appearing. Caesar is cited to the effect that Gaul had only two classes of honor and account, "the nobles [rather druids, in Caesar] and the knights". Then it is added, "They keep their freedom in the Middle Ages" (p. 38). Not much sense of the realities, or of Caesar, lies behind such a comment on the origins of feudal nobility. Or behind the comment, apropos of town changes: "The eleventh century was an age of lordship and vassalage; the twelfth of brotherhood and equality" (p. 59). At times what lies behind is plainly sheer ignorance. Witness just one glaring bit, concerning monasticism: "In 1086 the Italian Peter Damian first founded the Carthusian Order. . . . The Order made some headway in France . . . but it never became really naturalized in France" (p. 90). Shade of Bruno of Cologne! What thinkest thou of this, retracing perchance the departure from Reims and the quest for a secluded spot on the mountain above Grenoble? And thy successors in that spot, would they all agree that Carthusians and France have been so nearly dissociated?

No doubt a judiciously guided reader, with say an undergraduate's interests, should find some useful pabulum in this book. But on the whole he might better seek in Luchaire's lectures on social France in the time of Philip Augustus; or Funck-Brentano's recent portrayal of medieval France, despite its curious magnifying of the family as foundation for feudalism; or even W. S. Davis's account of a hypothetical seignior, in *Life on a Mediaeval Barony*.

E. W. Dow.

Die Kaiserwahl Friedrichs IV. und Karls V. (am 27. und 28. Juni 1519). Von PAUL KALKOFF. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger. 1925. Pp. x, 307. 12 M.)

AFTER devoting more than twoscore years to the study of the Reformation along the Rhine during the decade from 1515 to 1525, Paul Kalkoff is well qualified to write with almost unequalled authority upon

this period. To introduce the story of the imperial election of 1519, he first sets forth the position of the European powers, then the attitude of princes within Germany, and next, in great detail, the military and political preparations made by the industrious Spanish-Burgundian agents. The motives of each elector, the attempts to secure his vote, the important events just preceding the election, and finally the two election days—the first on which Frederick was elected and forced to resign, and the second on which Charles was chosen emperor—are fully described.

The election of Charles V. is pictured as the triumph of a criminal attack upon German nationality by Spanish bandits, who waylaid the electors and stole the crown. Frederick is exalted as the embodiment of honor, the defender of the German constitution against the vicious encroachments of Habsburg lust, and the victim of a carefully planned *Staatsstreich* atrociously executed. Rejecting the traditional belief in the patriotism of the Rhenish nobility, Kalkoff asserts that they were corrupted by bribes, that the city of Frankfort failed to protect the electors, and that the adulation of Charles by contemporary writers is a misleading indication of public opinion.

As a result of Kalkoff's researches, the fact is established beyond contradiction that the election of Charles was due, not to corruption of the electors by bribery, nor the demand of Germany and Europe, but solely to the superior propaganda and military power of the Spaniards. They had an army on the ground. Not only did a majority of the electors favor the choice of Frederick, but also the pope, England, and ultimately France supported his candidacy. With convincing arguments Kalkoff destroys the validity of the "Habsburg Legend" that Charles was a German prince, the defender of German nationalism against the ambition of such foreigners as Francis. On the other hand, the "Saxon Legend" that Frederick resigned because he felt too old and too weak to bear the burden of imperial duties is shown to be equally fallacious. Among other contributions the most important are the survey of contemporary opinion, the revelation of the indispensable financial assistance of the Fuggers, the disclosure of the crucial throttling of a free election by the Spanish army, the accusation that the economic ambitions of the imperial cities influenced them to favor Charles, and the proof of the validity of Frederick's election.

As in his other works, the author often confuses the reader by an unsystematic arrangement, an involved style, and a tendency to run ahead of his story. In lauding Frederick as a paragon of virtue his Protestant and nationalistic bias leads him into error, for the Saxon prince was more the champion of the electoral oligarchy than of German rights. Likewise, the Germany which Kalkoff continually has in mind is not the conglomerate medley of selfish states which existed in the sixteenth century, but the firmly consolidated empire of modern times.

Yet these questionable conceptions are far outweighed by the merits of the book; its scholarly and untiring investigation of the sources, its

critical and original treatment of the subject, and its exhaustive presentation of the facts in the case. Kalkoff has vindicated the honesty of the majority of the electors, he has established the right of Frederick IV. to a place among the German emperors, and he has fastened upon Charles V. the stigma of corruption in the beginning of a reign largely responsible for the subsequent woes of Germany.

HASTINGS EELLS.

Correspondance Française de Marguerite d'Autriche, Duchesse de Parme, avec Philippe II. Éditée d'après les copies faites par M. R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink, par J. S. THEISSEN. Tome I. *La Correspondance de Février 1565 jusqu'à la Fin de 1567.* [Publications de l'Historisch Genootschap, Utrecht, troisième série, no. 47.] (Utrecht: Kemink et Fils. 1925. Pp. xiv, 488. 12.50 gulden.)

IN his preface to his *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, Motley records his obligation to the Netherlands chief archivist of that day, the indefatigable Bakhuizen van den Brink, and to the Belgian archivist-general, M. Gachard. Since Motley's day a great deal of the source-material which he found only in difficult manuscript form has been published and made easily accessible to scholars everywhere. Gachard printed Philip's Spanish correspondence dealing with the Netherlands; and with the help of letters collected and placed at his disposal by Bakhuizen he published also the correspondence in French between Margaret in Brussels and her half-brother, from its beginning till February 3, 1565. Bakhuizen's labors in bringing together and transcribing these letters, in Liège, Vienna, Brussels, and the Hague, rival those of the coral insect for patience, and consumed years of his industrious life. But, owing to a series of chances and changes which would require more space to recount than is allowed for this entire notice, the letters from 1565 on did not find their way into print till this year. They have been carefully recopied and edited by J. S. Theissen of the library of the University of Groningen, and the expensive enterprise of their publication has been financed by the Historical Society of Utrecht, aided by grants from the governments of Holland and Belgium.

Even in its present printed form the correspondence would still not have been easy of consultation, in its lumbering, strangely spelled sixteenth-century French, Margaret anxiously pleading and verbose and Philip coldly omniscient and verbose, if it had not been for the editor's remarkably able summary of the letters by letter and page, which summary in itself fills nearly fifty large quarto pages. I have subjected this summary to some severe tests, and in most although not quite all the instances where it first struck me as inaccurate or unwise, I found before leaving it that the inaccuracy or unwisdom had not been Professor Theissen's, but his reviewer's. Particularly with proper names did Bakhuizen

and after him Theissen experience a great deal of difficulty, but their conjecture in doubtful cases is always plausible. It would have been difficult to do the work more nearly flawlessly than these patient scholars have done it.

These last years of Margaret's in Flanders were those of the ascendancy of Mansfeld, and one must not forget that Margaret's letters are largely Mansfeld's, whereas Philip's are always Philip's own. Mansfeld disapproved of the Spanish Inquisition for Flanders, and urged the assembling of the States-General and an amnesty covering all but a few leaders. Philip stonily repeats that he is changing nothing but only maintaining institutions which his father established at the behest of God. Margaret's pictures of the Flemish leaders are for the most part not flattering, but they are probably not far from the life. All the chief leaders—till Orange's shift in 1567—were, not Lutheran or Calvinist, but Catholic, and their insistence on religious tolerance was probably less a matter of sympathy or justice than a desire to keep open the avenues of profitable trade with Protestant Germany and Protestant England. The mainsprings of Philip's actions were much less *terre-à-terre*; still, the Philip who writes (in a letter dated October 17, 1565) of the maintenance of the Inquisition and "*le plaisir et contentement que ce me sera*", excites any emotion but sympathy, whereas Margaret, whose counsels, throughout this period, are all of mercy and tolerance, and who suffers as she pleads, is an appealing and touching figure.

R. T. HOUSE.

Elizabethan Episcopal Administration: an Essay in Sociology and Politics. By W. P. M. KENNEDY, Litt.D., Assistant Professor of Modern History in the University of Toronto. [Alcuin Club Collections, XXVI., XXVII.] In three volumes. (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company; Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company. 1924. Pp. xii, ccxlix; 135; 136-351. £ 3 3 s.)

As the subtitle indicates, these volumes form numbers XXVI. and XXVII. of the Alcuin Club Collections. In the advertisement at the end of each volume they are numbered XXV.-XXVII. As vols. II. and III. are continuous in their paging it is quite possible that a mistake has been made in numbering vols. I. and II. the same.

Like preceding numbers of the Alcuin Collections the volumes are published with care. They are well bound; they are printed on good paper and in a clear and attractive type. The publishers are to be commended for the quality of their work.

Also, like preceding numbers, these contributions are of value to students of English ecclesiastical and political history. They are of value to the former because they throw light on the detail and purpose of Elizabethan canon law and on the causes which led to the precise form of the Elizabethan Prayer Book. They are of value to the latter because

Kennedy: Elizabethan Episcopal Administration 311

they are (and this is the author's primary purpose) a study in sociology and politics.

Volumes II. and III. contain Visitation Articles and Injunctions dating from 1575 to 1603. In other words, they are a collection of documents illustrating the close and detailed relationship between state and church and the similar relationship between archbishops and bishops and the dioceses and parishes under their control. They are, in short, a source-book for the period and the purpose.

Volume I. is an essay based on the evidence gathered in volumes II. and III. It is in this volume that the purpose of the author and editor appears.

Professor Kennedy has already published, with Dr. Frere, studies of the visitations of the immediately preceding period. On the later period he speaks with authority and persuasion, not only because of his evident mastery of his subject, but because of his frank admission that there are certain aspects of the topic on which he does not care to speak and others on which he is not competent at present to pass an opinion. In a commendable way he warns his reader from time to time not to look for a final answer. He clearly states the limits of his inquiry. In the preface to the essay he says that the late Dr. Figgis suggested that he might use his material for the purpose of political and sociological study. He has followed the advice; and he has not deviated from his purpose.

In working out his purpose he has divided the essay into eight chapters: the Material, the Permanent Forces at Work in Administration, the Parish Church, the Parish Clergy, the Laity, the Parish Officials, Puritan and Recusant, the Tudor Political Theory. If the reviewer were hypercritical he would say that, so far as form is concerned, the author has loaded down his text with an over-supply of evidence. He might easily have thrown much of the evidence into the form of foot-notes and in this way he might have made the book more readable without losing any of its convincing character. However, if he has erred, it has been on the side of thoroughness. Again, if the reviewer were hypercritical, he would say that Professor Kennedy may have followed Dr. Figgis's suggestion a little too narrowly. One of the most fascinating and illuminating aspects of Dr. Figgis's method was the way in which he caught the inner spirit of the movement of which he was writing. It is difficult to see how one can be true to Dr. Figgis and at the same time cling quite so closely to the *apparent* interpretation of the material in hand. There were subtle and hidden causes at work which, together with the apparent causes, brought about the result. Without doubt the Elizabethan state thought it a religious duty to hold a firm and a controlling hand on the church. It could not, and it did not, leave any appreciable room for individual or group freedom. Under the circumstances, that is, with the Puritan and the Roman dangers both within and without, and with the rising consciousness of self-sufficient nationalism, it ought not to have left any room (for the time being) for either individual or group free-

dom. Elizabeth was right in espousing the *cujus regio ejus religio*. And yet Elizabeth never could have done it and the state never could have brought such terrific pressure to bear had not the people been *religiously* in sympathy with their action. The Book of Common Prayer was not the product solely of either scholars, men of religious genius, or the state, nor was its use a product of the Acts of Uniformity. It was the spontaneous expression of the heart of the bulk of the people. It may be that Professor Kennedy has not taken this political and social cause fully into account.

However, true or false though this reflection may be, Professor Kennedy has had a point to make and he has made it clearly. The later Elizabethan control of church by the state was a necessary political and social stage in the development of the relationship between state and church. The final chapter makes the point abundantly clear. Although it is very brief it reviews in a masterly way medieval theories of government; it describes the thought in the transition from later medieval to modern times; it points to the contribution made by the Oxford Movement. It surveys the field from the time when there was a papal internationalism to the time, not yet altogether arrived, when the individual and the group shall have won their rightful freedom within the state. The essay should take its place with Dr. Figgis's studies in the church's contribution to political and social theory.

HENRY BRADFORD WASHBURN.

Europe in the Seventeenth Century. By DAVID OGG. [The History of Europe, edited by E. Lipson.] (London: A. and C. Black. 1925. Pp. xi, 579. 18 s.)

WHEN will the flood of historical "series" stop? It continues unabated in every field of history—and now we are to be given a new one, "a survey of the History of Europe from the break-up of the Roman Empire down to the present day", a work to be "based as far as possible on original authorities", and to "take into account the extensive monographic literature which has grown up within recent years". Of this series Mr. Ogg's book is an early volume, a happy presage, let us hope, of the others which are to come, for it is a distinct success. If the others are as good, the "Period" series, edited by Hassall, will be satisfactorily replaced.

In his preface Mr. Ogg explains that by "summarizing the less important campaigns and confining the record of royal intrigues to moderate dimensions, it has been found possible to say something of the social conditions, the economic theories, the religious controversies, the public opinion and the philosophical thought of the period"—on the Continent; consideration of the British Isles is omitted, except incidentally. By this he does not mean that the more familiar diplomatic and political history is neglected in his volume but that he has found space to broaden the scope

of the work. A concluding sentence—"The permanent things of the seventeenth century are neither its dynasties nor its politics, but its imaginative art and the constructive work of its thinkers", epitomizes his point of view.

With this in mind, it is fair to say that the chapters on France are by far the best, as was to be expected from the author of *The Grand Design of Henry IV.*, and of a study of Cardinal de Retz. Here there is most evidence of the use of sources and of little known monographs. Of these chapters that on Jesuit and Jansenist is a brilliant summary of a much misunderstood controversy, while the concluding chapter, on the Seventeenth Century in History, is a bit of broad treatment so often lacking in our surveys, one wishes that it was longer. On the other hand Germany, northern and eastern Europe are less satisfactorily handled and the development of science is distinctly neglected. A few minor errors have been noticed. The pages on French taxation (pp. 24-25) are misleading because the explanation is too brief. Sweden did not lose all her German provinces during the period, as is repeatedly stated (pp. 3, 4, 472) and as is shown on a map (p. 280). Part of Pomerania remained in Swedish hands until 1815. Maps (pp. 280, 514) show all of Greece in 1699 and 1714 as still a part of the Ottoman Empire, notwithstanding the terms of the treaty of Karlowitz of 1699.

Occasionally Mr. Ogg expresses himself rather strongly about the personages of the period—"The most criminally stupid man in history, he acted on the worst principles of a bad past, disgracing his country rather than himself by the unquestioning obedience which he extorted, and exercising on posterity an influence second only to that of Napoleon in its baneful fascination for the shallow and flashy mind" (p. 230). But Louis XIV. has not lacked admirers, among them Lord Acton. There is less difference of opinion as to Peter the Great, but to speak of Peter's intelligence as "sometimes not unlike that of the chimpanzee", while "his temper was like that of the orang-outang" (p. 514), seems to overdo the matter.

Such outbursts are rare. The book is in the main judicial in tone and always is readable. An excellent and in part critical bibliography is appended.

HENRY R. SHIPMAN.

A Calendar of the Court Minutes, etc., of the East India Company, 1664-1667. By ETHEL BRUCE SAINSBURY. With an Introduction and Notes by Sir WILLIAM FOSTER, C.I.E. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xxix, 466. 21 s.)

As usual in this series Sir William Foster contributes a valuable introduction to the documents which Miss Sainsbury by her industry and acumen has brought together and edited. The period 1664-1667 is one

of nominal peace and actual war with the Dutch. It opens with persistent claims by the English that the Dutch are not observing previous treaties and that they are by trickery or force wilfully hostile to English rights in the East Indies. The Dutch, for example, would enter into a contract with some native ruler for a monopoly of the exports of his state despite the fact that an English agency or factory was already established in his territory. Or again, failing this, they would declare war against a native ruler and on this excuse maintain a blockade against his coasts, to the vast inconvenience of English shipping. Furthermore for some time they refused to surrender Pulo Run and later, on the renewal of war in 1665, promptly seized it again.

The East India Company voiced its complaints with vigor but was by no means anxious for the outbreak of hostilities for they declared that the "worst of peace is better than the best warr". However, on April 21, 1664, the House of Commons unanimously resolved "that the wrongs, dishonours, and indignities done to His Majesty by the subjects of the United Provinces, by invading of his rights in India, Africa, and elsewhere, and the damages, affronts, and injuries done by them to our merchants, are the greatest obstruction of our foreign trade . . .". A year later the war was on. The first areas of operation were, however, not in the East Indies but off the West African coast, where at Goree Dutch shipping was captured. This was probably due to the fact of royal financial interest in the Royal African Company. In similar fashion an expedition was despatched westward to seize New Amsterdam and to christen that settlement New York. The complaints of the East India Company regarding lack of protection and the consequent almost complete suspension of the services of their fleets to India were marked. Particularly at the peace of Breda did the Company find its interests neglected. The representatives of the Company at Breda wrote home that they found themselves excluded from satisfaction and "all our concernes out of doores".

In 1667, however, the crown was anxious to dispose of the island of Bombay which had been recently acquired from Portugal. Friction and inefficiency had marked the royal administration and finally the Company agreed to take the island over. Later it was to become one of the most valued British possessions. There was also frequent trouble over unlicensed or private trade. Finally the employees of the Company in London were forbidden to communicate privately with anyone in India. This attempt at an embargo does not seem to have been successful for the problem of private trade comes up again and again. The profits of the Company continued to be huge. Thus between 1661 and 1665 dividends were declared as follows: 1661, 20 per cent.; 1663, 40 per cent.; 1664-1665, 40 per cent. Thus this distribution returned to subscribers their full capital within eight years (1657-1665) and on a valuation of the Company's assets left 30 per cent. as yet undivided.

This period also includes the visitation of the plague and the Great Fire in London. With the outbreak of the plague most of the directors or "Committees" fled to the country leaving only a very few to carry on business. Later these were handsomely rewarded and their "ladies" received valuable presents of silks and calicoes. The Great Fire did not reach East India House but there was much rushing about to protect the Company's goods which were housed in various parts of the City. Eventually the Company did not suffer any loss. The index to this volume is excellent.

A. L. P. DENNIS.

La Réaction Wesléyenne dans l'Évolution Protestante: Étude d'Histoire Religieuse. Par MAXIMIN PIETTE, Docteur en Théologie. [Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Series II., Tomus 16.] (Brussels: La Lecture au Foyer. 1925. Pp. xv, 680, plates. 25 fr.)

THIS is the first time that a Roman Catholic scholar has given a full, impartial, thoroughly well documented history of Wesley and his movement in England. A student at Louvain, the author journeyed repeatedly to England to make his study, gives an occasional glimpse of what he saw or heard there, and went back with rich spoils. The remarkable thing about the book is the warm regard in which it holds Wesley, based on an unusual insight into his character and work, defending him even against Methodist critics, and showing excellent knowledge of his writings (of which he gives long extracts in the text in French), of his aims, and of his times.

The movement is prepared for in leisurely fashion. To Luther and Zwingli are given 20 pages, to what the author calls the reactions against them 130 pages (that is, Anabaptist, English, and Calvinist), to a general view of the eighteenth century in Europe 10 pages, to a careful study of the religious conditions in that century in England 130 pages, and the bulky remainder is devoted to a careful and even minute study of the preparations for Wesley, his own life, the developments of Methodism under his preaching, and its developments since his death to the present, closing with three chapters on its general place in Protestant evolution, its doctrine, and its organization. The book closes with a detailed table of contents, but unfortunately has no index. By far the most valuable part is that which gives the title to the whole. Here, for a Catholic, the author's impartiality, yet inner sympathy, and large knowledge have made a splendid contribution to church history.

One or two corrections. Zwingli did not hold that the Eucharist was a simple remembrance, a hollow sign, and that it was void of all reality (p. 11). On p. 284 for V. read VI. Wesley was never a rough or harsh preacher ("rude", p. 293), but always courteous and refined (his sermons

too intellectual if anything, frequently quoting Latin), though he followed Christ in dealing with the darker side of truth. P. 294: for "is it" read *are you*. It is not true that nobody ever took up the glove thrown down by Tyerman's (himself a Methodist) perhaps over-frank and cavalier treatment of his hero Wesley (p. 308). In his *The Living Wesley*, rev. ed. 1891, Dr. Rigg did this. The author is wrong in saying (p. 446) that the so-called conversion of Wesley in May, 1738, was to the love of God, rather than to a new life of simple trust in the grace of Christ, for forgiveness, eternal life, etc. Wesley had the love of God long before and kept it, but not this quiet trust of faith. The quotations from Boutroux and Leger (pp. 446-447) apparently make the change of 1738 simply a natural psychological reaction of no special objective or religious validity, and do not at all explain the later activity of Wesley as a preacher of immediate salvation through faith which was the driving spring of his movement. It is unjust and unhistorical to emphasize too much the power of Protestant princes as explaining the Reformation (p. 574). Catholic princes had exactly the same power, and it was besides a medieval evolution. In regard to Wesley's reaction against Luther (p. 579), the author cannot be blamed for making the most of this, though it puts Wesley out of perspective as to his attitude here. As a matter of fact, the Englishman did not understand Luther at all on the doctrine for which he blames him, and had not adequately studied even the *Commentary on Galatians*. So also on p. 647 the author is wrong, resting on a misunderstanding of Luther and an insufficient knowledge of Wesley in regard to faith and justification. As to sanctification, while it showed itself of course in the practice of Christian virtues and of good works (p. 603), it was not this but was the shedding of the love of God in the heart by faith of which the fruit was Christian virtues, etc. Wesley had no scientific knowledge of Luther's theology; if he had he would have perceived that he deviated from him in this matter in no essential particular.

On the other hand the author is perfectly right in holding that the experience of 1738 did not at all mean that Wesley had been a "sinner" whether in his school life or later (pp. 346-347). He is also right as to the so-called "ambitions" of Wesley (pp. 347-348), and—over against Thureau-Dangin—that Methodism was careful as to the formal setting apart of ministers to administer sacraments, as was also Puritanism (p. 399). So also that Wesley was not the disciple of Luther or Calvin (p. 647), though the late Professor Briggs of Union Theological Seminary had the insight to see, what Dr. Piette does not, that Methodism sprang from Puritanism rather than from Anglicanism.

J. H. FAULKNER.

The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827. England, the Neo-Holy Alliance, and the New World. By HAROLD TEMPERLEY, Reader in Modern History in the University of Cambridge. (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1925. Pp. xxiv, 636. 25 s.)

MR. TEMPERLEY'S book, a companion volume, in a sense, to Professor Webster's *Castlereagh*, is, like the previous work, a diplomatic narrative solidly based on prolonged and extended research. The author has seen not only the collections of the Public Record Office, but the Austrian and French diplomatic correspondence as well, to say nothing of valuable collections of private papers, of which perhaps the most important are the Granville papers, and the hitherto unused Diary of Madame Lieven. The Russian archives, comprehensibly enough in present circumstances, have not been consulted. One cannot help feeling that, when they are put in order and made truly accessible, they may add something to Mr. Temperley's consideration of the Greek question, but, on the other hand, it is to be said that much important Russian material is to be found at Vienna.

Some of Mr. Temperley's most important discoveries with regard to Canning's foreign policy, such, for example, as the intrigues of the "Cottage Coterie" and the activities of Madame Lieven in connection with the Anglo-Russian rapprochement on the Greek question, have already been treated by him in special articles, and need not be discussed here. There is much in his book that is new as well as valuable. The account of the technique and machinery of Canning's diplomacy deals with an interesting and too much neglected phase of diplomacy in general. The treatment of Brazilian and Portuguese affairs is the first really adequate account in English, though we have, of course, the works of Oliveira Lima in Portuguese for the period down to August, 1825. More important than either of these is the excellent general summary and analysis of Canning's policy, and appraisal of its significance.

This summary is, indeed, the core of the book. Canning aimed, Mr. Temperley points out, at a *juste milieu* between militant liberalism and ultra-Toryism. He was, in fact, not so much a liberal as a non-interventionist, though he was, on occasion, obliged to depart from his non-interventionist principles. On the side of the territorial settlements created by the treaties of Vienna (and the point is both an interesting and a just one), he was in favor of the *status quo*. Feeling a certain sympathy with nationalism, he was yet, in general, no friend to revolutionary nationalist agitation. Not necessarily hostile to democracy, he was in no sense a partizan or advocate of democratic principle. His policy, for all its glamorous appeal to European liberals, was essentially conservative.

Perhaps the two most interesting points with regard to Canning's diplomacy are, first, his use of publicity, and, second, his breach with the Congress system and with the Neo-Holy Alliance. With regard to the

first, Mr. Temperley seems slightly on the defensive. Against the frequently-offered criticism that Canning was impulsive, rash, and sometimes even provocative in speech, he sets forth the fact that he was rarely, if ever, rash in action. His views with regard to this point carry full conviction. But they leave the main criticism still standing. Canning's appeals to public opinion were, no doubt, again and again the means of buttressing and extending his popularity at home; by mobilizing British sentiment behind him they may have made him feared abroad. But it is possible to believe, more strongly than does Mr. Temperley, that they often savored rather of the politician than of the statesman, and that they were not always, by any means, the necessary apparatus to his success.

With regard to the breach with the Neo-Holy Alliance, on the other hand, Canning's action was probably inevitable. No British minister could have acted otherwise, in view of British public opinion. Nor did the breach mean that Britain's policy was to be one of unrestrained individualism. Mr. Temperley well indicates that it is possible to exaggerate British aloofness. Canning co-operated with Austria, and was ready to go further along the same path, with regard to the Brazilian question in 1823-1824; he came to an accord with Russia on the Greek question; and almost the last act of his life was a triple alliance for the solution of Greek affairs. To these examples might have been added the important fact that, even on the crucial question of the Spanish colonies, Canning was ready for *conferences*, though not for a *Congress*, at the end of 1823, and that a little earlier he would probably have been willing to find a working basis of agreement with France. In the light of these facts, it would be excessive to charge the British Foreign Secretary with substituting a purely insular policy for Castlereagh's conscientious effort at European co-operation. "Every nation for itself, and God for us all," was not so exclusive a principle as it sounded. Canning represented no isolationist doctrine, and he represented it less than ever toward the end of his career.

Canning's interest in, his heavy emphasis on, American affairs is well known. In dealing with these matters, however, Mr. Temperley seems somewhat unduly favorable to the British minister. How far Canning won a great triumph in South American affairs is naturally to be measured by the reality of the danger which threatened the new states when, in October, 1823, he took a decisive stand in their favor. Mr. Temperley, though expressing himself with caution, seems to the reviewer to take the danger too seriously. It is true that at various times in 1821 and 1822 and 1823 the French ministers had in mind French aid in establishing an Infante in one or another of the states of South America, and that they played with the idea of limited coercive action. But there are countervailing considerations which ought not to be omitted from regard. One is the strength of French commercial interests, insistent upon a friendly policy toward the new states, and Villèle's sympathy with those interests; a second is the fact that the Bourbon monarchy scheme,

as outlined in the cabinet council of July 4, 1823, was made contingent upon a moderate constitutionalism in Spain, something hardly to be expected from the restored Ferdinand; a third, of great importance, is the positive aversion of the Catholic King to the whole Infante idea. Taking all these factors into consideration, looking at French policy on all its sides, it is very difficult to believe that South America was really in danger from French aggression. Canning's policy was based upon exaggerated suspicions.

It was the same with the Secretary's later policy toward the United States. It rested upon a false notion of American influence and of the possibilities of American leadership. There never was a time, in the opinion of the reviewer, not even immediately after the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, when British prestige in South America was not far greater than that of this country. And how unreal was the danger of American hegemony is amply demonstrated by the violent attacks upon the very limited policy of co-operation suggested by Clay and Adams in 1825 and 1826. In his jealous fear of an American league Canning was, as Mr. Temperley barely hints, tilting against windmills.

It is much the same story with regard to Cuba. What is the basis for the belief that France had designs on the island? She thought at one time of temporary occupation, but so, by Mr. Temperley's own statement, did Canning himself. That there was much difference between the two governments, that the British minister has any pretensions to having saved Cuba to Spain, is at least doubtful.

All this is not to say that Canning did not gain great prestige from his American policy, both at home and abroad. Mr. Temperley strongly insists upon this, and in terms which, though vigorous, are none too vigorous. But it was a triumph more impressive to the eyes of contemporaries than it seems impressive to-day. Even British recognition itself can hardly be said to have made any great practical difference in the immediate situation of the new states.

Outside of its relation to the colonial question, the British policy toward the United States is rather slighted in Mr. Temperley's volume, being for the most part relegated to the section which he describes as Notes on Certain Chapters. No one would maintain that such matters as the Northwest controversy, the slave-trade convention, and the West Indian commercial difficulties are of major importance beside the unfolding of the European drama, and yet Anglo-American relations are of real significance, none the less, and in this particular instance they set off the character of two very remarkable men in Canning and Adams. It is possible to regret, therefore, that they have not been treated somewhat more fully.

So much for the substance of the book itself. Mr. Temperley's bibliographical material, organized by chapters, shows the widest and most accurate knowledge of the field. From this point of view he has rendered a great service. The appendixes which he has incorporated at the end of

the volume are also valuable, none more so than Lebzelter's conversations with Nesselrode when it was learned that Russia had gone over to England.

Finally, a word must be said as to the excellent style of the whole narrative. A work of scholarship is not always easy reading. But no reproaches can be addressed to Mr. Temperley on that score. He has made his subject highly interesting at the same time that he has made a substantial contribution to scholarship.

DEXTER PERKINS.

Det Nordslesvigske Spørgsmaal, 1864-1879. Aktstykker og Breve til Belysning af den Danske Regerings Politik, paa Udenrigsministeriets Forenstillinger udgivet af AAGE FRIIS. I. Bind, Fra Efteraaret 1864 til Marts 1868; II. Bind, Fra 1. April 1868 til 31. December 1870. (Copenhagen: Henrik Koppel. 1925. Pp. v, 840; iii, 798.)

Den Danske Regering og Nordslesvigs Genforening med Danmark. En historisk Fremstilling. Af AAGE FRIIS. Første Bind, Artikel V.s Tilblivelse og Forhandlingerne om dens Udførelse 1864-1868. (Copenhagen: Henrik Koppel. 1921. Pp. 459.)

Danmark ved Krigsudbrudet Juli-August 1870. En historisk Fremstilling af den Danske Regerings Politik. Af AAGE FRIIS. (Copenhagen: Henrik Koppel. 1923. Pp. 222.)

"Ophævelsen af Pragfredens Artikel 5." Aage Friis in *Tilskueren* (Copenhagen), 1921, pp. 106-118. German translation under the title "Die Aufhebung des Artikels V. des Prager Friedens", in *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXV. (1921) 45-62.

WHEN the plebiscite of 1920 added the northern part of Schleswig to the kingdom of Denmark, the Danish Ministry for Foreign Affairs decided to publish "without reserve" an account of the efforts made by the various Danish cabinets since 1864 to bring about this result. Professor Aage Friis of the University of Copenhagen, who is especially qualified for the task by his thorough knowledge of both Danish and German history and by his sound and balanced judgment, was chosen to edit a collection of documents on the subject. These are to cover the period from the Treaty of Vienna of October 30, 1864, to the publication in 1879 of the Austro-German treaty abrogating the relevant clause of Article V. of the Treaty of Prague of 1866, which removed the question of the recovery of North Schleswig by Denmark from the realm of practical politics.

The 961 documents in the two volumes that have appeared to date deal in the minutest detail with the thoughts and actions of the directors and agents of Danish foreign policy in reference to the North Schles-

wig question and with the personal and party factors in Danish politics that aided or, more often, hindered the government in carrying out its policy.

The most important parts of volume I. deal with the attempt of the Danish government, on the advice of the French Foreign Office, to secure a limited alliance with Prussia on the eve of the Austro-Prussian War; the attempt of the Austrian government to persuade the Danes to invade Schleswig on the outbreak of that war; the attitude of the Danish government on receiving the unexpected news of the inclusion of the provision for the retrocession of part of Schleswig in the preliminary peace of Nikolsburg; and the details of the official negotiations of Denmark and Prussia for the execution of the resulting clause of Article V. of the Treaty of Prague. Volume II. includes the attempt of the Danish government, instigated by Bismarck, to influence the Tsar of Russia to intercede personally with the King of Prussia; General Fleury's known, but apparently unauthorized, attempt to open the question at the beginning of his embassy at Petersburg late in 1869; and the attempt of France to secure the aid of Denmark at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. Of particular interest to American students are occasional sidelights on the attitude of various Danish politicians towards the sale of the Danish West Indies, especially the despatch of May 18, 1866, instructing the minister at Washington to drag out the negotiations for the time being, lest news of them irritate France and England, whose sympathy for the satisfaction of Danish national aspirations in Schleswig was desired in the proposed European Congress.

The refusal of the German authorities to permit Professor Friis to study the Prussian and German archives was a serious handicap. He has, however, had access to the relevant documents in the Austrian, Swedish, and French archives, and has recently received permission to study the British and Russian documents. Some of the Austrian and Swedish materials will be printed in the last volume of the documentary collection. The French sources, which were used by Franz de Jessen in *L'Intervention de la France dans la Question du Slesvig du Nord* (Paris, 1919), will not be reprinted as they are appearing in full in *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870-1871* (Paris, 1910 ff.). These materials have been used, however, in the studies listed above, in which Professor Friis is incorporating the full results of his research.

The first of these studies covers the same period as volume I. of the documentary collection. The use of the supplementary materials enables the author to give a better rounded picture of the subject, especially of the negotiations at Nikolsburg and Prague on which the Austrian documents throw much new light.

The later volumes of this book will benefit by the recent publication of documents from the Berlin archives. The second study is a thorough examination of the Franco-Danish negotiations and of the position of the Danish government on the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. The

periodical article shows from the materials in the Austrian archives that the abrogation of Article V. of the Treaty of Prague occurred not in the fall of 1878, as was published at the time, but in April of that year; that is, before and not after the Congress of Berlin.

LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

The European Powers and the Near East, 1875-1908. By MASON WHITING TYLER, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. [University of Minnesota Studies in the Social Sciences, no. 17.] (Minneapolis: the University. 1925. Pp. viii, 234. \$2.00.)

THE difficulties which usually confront the reviewer of a posthumous work are enhanced in the present case, where the manuscript was left incomplete and where the essay deals with a period of modern politics for which source-material has been flowing from the press uninterruptedly for half a decade. The editorial note states that Professor Tyler left the manuscript of chapters I. to IX. inclusive (carrying the story roughly to 1900) in practically complete form. The remaining two chapters are in part at least the work of Professors Earle of Columbia and Davis of Minnesota.

Professor Tyler was well advised in undertaking a history of the Eastern question since the outbreak of the crisis of 1875-1878, for there is no adequate account in existence anywhere. Choublier's work is antiquated and the general texts are either sketchy or not abreast of the latest literature. Perhaps the best chapters of the present work are the first four, which are general in scope and treat the problem of the Near East as a whole, the nature of Turkish rule, the emergence of the Balkan states, the conflicting interests of the European powers. There is little that is novel even here, and one might wish for a more profound analysis of problems like the decline of Ottoman power, the difficulties in the way of reform, and the effects of European intervention. But these chapters are well written, the material presented in a sober and fair-minded way.

No such favorable comment can be made on the succeeding chapters, especially those dealing with the crisis of 1875-1878 and the Bulgarian complications of 1885-1887. For these events the author might have used the first six volumes of the *Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette* and Corti's *Alexander von Battenberg*, to mention only two of the richest funds of material. Corti's book, which appeared in 1921, is never referred to, and the author seems not to have used the German documents himself. In any case the text shows that this material was never thoroughly worked into the account. It is, in fact, difficult to believe that even Wertheimer's *Graf Julius Andrássy* was fully utilized, for the author is constantly floundering about helplessly and indulging in conjectures, many of which are quite gratuitous. On page 57 alone the expressions "seems to have", "apparently", or their equivalents occur a dozen

times, while in that chapter fully fifty such phrases could be counted. Almost every statement is qualified, giving the story a tone of uncertainty which was inevitable before the publication of the sources, but which is no longer justifiable. Dr. Tyler would presumably have satisfied himself on many points, had he lived, but it is hard to understand how the editors could have allowed the book to go to press bristling with uncertainties, misstatements, and needless inferences.

In this connection it should be pointed out that the proof was read in an inexcusably careless manner. There are at least a dozen misspellings in two and one half pages of bibliography. Naturally the proper names suffer most. *Goriainov* is not spelled correctly a single time in the footnotes. On page 199 may be found the following extraordinary French, from "Dibidour" (*sic.*): "des resultats mediocre ou insufficient." This is characteristic of the whole book.

Chapter X., on the Bagdad Railway, shows evidence of Professor Earle's industry. He at least has learned from the German documents and has written a good brief account of the great German enterprise. His estimate of Marschall seems overdrawn and not wholly correct, and his somewhat journalistic style jars a bit after Tyler's over-cautious statements. The last chapter, on Macedonia and Bosnia, is almost entirely the work of Professor Davis, and may be described as a readable though conventional account. As in the greater part of the book, there is almost no evidence that the mass of new material has been consulted or utilized.

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

Twenty-Five Years, 1892-1916. By Viscount GREY OF FALLODEN, K. G. (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 1925. Pp. xxx, 331; ix, 352. \$10.00.)

THIS is an honest book by a single-minded and simple-hearted lover of peace. You will not find in it startling revelations of state secrets nor indeed much that runs counter to those official records that are now available to anyone who can read. You will find, however, the story of how certain aspects of foreign policy impressed the mind of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The book is, therefore, more than a mere chronicle; it is a psychological study as well. These volumes contain naïve statements as to what the author thought might be done at given instances. Nothing is concealed and the astonishing indifference which Lord Grey showed to certain vital aspects and effects of the policies agreed on is frequently evident. In short this is a personal record rather than an official history or a painstaking academic performance. When Sir Edward Grey (as we have so long been accustomed to call him) forgets occasionally what he said in reply to some ambassador he says so. It is these very lapses, the utter lack of self-esteem, and the frankness and charm of the narrative that give special character to the book as a whole. There are also glimpses, which are only too rare, of Sir Edward as a

lover of nature and as a fisherman. These memoirs are, however, political rather than domestic.

The materials used are of course Lord Grey's own recollections of what happened. He was the first Foreign Secretary who did not carry off his papers from the Foreign Office when he quit office. These are still in the care of the government. To enable him to make use of them permission was granted to Mr. J. A. Spender to search the files and to assist in the selection of material. The Windsor Archives were also used in the same manner, but there is scarcely a foot-note in either of the volumes. Many important letters are given in the text and in the appendixes are several public and private documents of great interest. It is a question, however, whether the author has familiarized himself with much of the controversial but revealing literature which has appeared on the causes of the War. If he has not done so it is probably due to the failing sight which led him to call on Mr. Spender for assistance. Certainly the critics of Russian and French policy will find small comfort in these pages. Apparently Lord Grey either accepts without question the official and public versions put about by Sazonov, Isvolski, and Poincaré, or he feels that it is a subject outside of his domain. The result is disappointing and the same might be said regarding the use of Austrian-German correspondence which is now available.

The field covered by the book, which practically starts with the author's appointment as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in 1892 under Lord Rosebery, is well indicated by the analytical table of contents. Lord Grey passes quickly over these years, 1892-1895; and the decade 1895-1905 when he was out of office is dismissed in a chapter. He criticizes the idea that Great Britain pursued a policy based on the "Balance of Power". From 1886-1902 he declares that England "sided diplomatically with the Triple Alliance" because "Great Britain has not in theory been adverse to the predominance of a strong group in Europe when it seemed to make for stability and peace". The British position in Egypt also required a certain adherence to Germany to win her support as against the two restless powers—France and Russia. Lord Grey adds (I. 5), "I have never, so far as I recollect, used the phrase 'Balance of Power'. I have often deliberately avoided the use of it, and I have never consciously set it before me as something to be pursued, attained, and preserved".

In December, 1905, Grey became Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in which office he continued till December, 1916. He reviews in succession the "first crisis"—the Algeiras Conference—troubles with Turkey and in Egypt, negotiations with Germany as to the North Sea, the establishment of an understanding with Russia, and the "second crisis"—that over the Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The accounts of the "third crisis" (Agadir) and of the "fourth crisis" (the Balkan Wars) clear the way for the last two chapters of the first volume, dealing with the events of 1914 to the outbreak of war. It is interesting to note

that the speech made in July, 1911, at the time of the Agadir crisis, by Lloyd George was at his own initiative following a brief conference with Grey. The reader may be disappointed, however, to find that the negotiations with Germany relative to Turkey up to June, 1914, are rather hurried over. Nor is there sufficient discussion of the Anglo-French military and naval conversations. The agreement by which the French fleets were concentrated in the Mediterranean and the British fleets in the Channel and North Sea barely receives mention. Indeed as regards these conversations Lord Grey shows at times an indifference that is remarkable. If war is a "continuation of policy", the fact that Lord Grey was not well equipped to deal with such problems as are involved in mobilization is at once evident.

This is made the clearer by the author's comment that "the statement that comprises most truth is that militarism, and the armaments inseparable from it, made War inevitable" (II. 53). The atmosphere of jealousy and suspicion which prevailed in Europe really makes one wonder why the war did not break out sooner. In the second volume are also discussions of questions of strategy, of the importance of America to the Allied cause, of negotiations with Colonel House, of Allied diplomacy to 1916, and a moderate defence of the Secret Treaties. Throughout is the impression of the *fear* that lay over Europe as a cloud. In conclusion Lord Grey adds, as he leaves office in 1916 (II. 256), "After the Peace, more especially in the last two years of the Lloyd George Government, its proceedings and conduct of affairs stirred me with indignation and despair such as I have never felt about any other British Government". Such a record of stewardship during these momentous years is in spite of certain faults an invaluable contribution to the better understanding of the facts in the case.

A. L. P. DENNIS.

The Public Life. By J. A. SPENDER. (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 1925. Pp. xxiii, 236; iii, 232. \$10.00.)

THE last sentence in Mr. Spender's interesting volumes is that of a benevolent stoic. His optimistic phrase is: "But our life becomes meaningless and our efforts vain unless we can as far as possible live the lives of immortals and think of ourselves as actively co-operating in a scheme which is somehow good." In public affairs the author still clings to the idea that the scheme is "somehow good" and, despite the many years of editorial life which have made Mr. Spender in various ways the *doyen* of Liberal journalists in London, he views the facts and the drama of the public life with clear but kindly eyes. Perhaps one reason for this is that he is historically minded. Scarcely a page but draws on the past for illustration or comparison. Indeed the first half of the first volume is devoted to analytical sketches of many of the older leaders, including the elder Pitt, Cobbett, James Mill, Cobden, Bright, Palmerston, Peel, Disraeli,

Gladstone, Chamberlain, Parnell, and a group of modern statesmen as well. Of Lloyd George he says: "he was the child of the hour: he instinctively understood the modern Press which was so painful a stumbling-block to his more solemn colleagues. He was, in the jargon of the day, the supreme propagandist. His mind leapt with that of Fleet Street; he seemed to deal with public affairs as if he were editing a popular newspaper with its 'splash' for every day, its headlines, its pictures" (I. 120-121). There follow sound discourse on "Politicians and Parliament", several chapters on "American and Foreign Examples", and in volume II. sections on "Democracy and Government", "The Press and the Public Life", and "The Ideas of the Public Man". Naturally these divisions are of unequal value. Yet the whole is a distinguished panorama of a crowded life in which the author brings an earnest yet cheerful philosophy to bear on the momentous events which he has observed at close range.

By selection we note Mr. Spender's views on certain special matters. As to Second Chambers he says (I. 120): "Is it not possible to reverse conventional thought on this subject and think in future of a preparatory rather than of a revising Chamber—a First rather than a Second Chamber—a Chamber which shall prepare the ground for legislation on burning questions; provide Government and the public with all the available knowledge on these subjects; show what the alternative solutions are and which, if any, of the solutions are barred by economic facts or unforeseen consequences; a Chamber in fact which would provide all that essential knowledge which is so apt to be obscured in the battles of parties and their electioneering cries?" To this conception and to the need of an Economic General Staff the author recurs more than once.

In the matter of rewards for public men and the maintenance of party "war-chests" Mr. Spender is also unconventional. Thus (II. 86), "to speak above a whisper about party funds is thought barely polite in British political circles, yet it must be known to everybody" that the necessary funds are not raised by "ordinary appeals". "The older British parties have generally obtained this money from wealthy supporters and rewarded them with 'honours', *i.e.*, with knighthoods, baronetcies, and peerages in an ascending scale according to their contributions." The author concludes (II. 92), "The honours system is no doubt better than the spoils system and if a choice must be made between the two we had better give our vote to the former". In such fashion the purity and integrity of the British Civil Service may be preserved at the sacrifice of the House of Lords.

Finally, as to the conduct of foreign affairs, the author has several shrewd comments to make. Writing of the older diplomacy he cites Bismarck as saying that parliamentary government disqualified the British. His verdict on Sir Edward Grey in the years before the World War is implied as he queries (II. 52), "How was a British Foreign Secretary, who had no secret-service funds, who held old-fashioned views about

Ministers and newspapers and the incorruptibility of the Press, and whose agent in Paris was Sir Francis Bertie, to hold his own among these very accomplished performers [the foreign diplomats]?" In his chapter on "The Press and Foreign Affairs" Mr. Spender emphasizes the responsibility of all those who write on international relations and adds (II. 137), "things being what they are, it is highly important that those who handle foreign affairs, whether ministers, officials, or journalists, should know their way about the European Press world and underworld". In general, therefore, we may agree with Professor Phelps of Yale, who has written of this book, "Its portraits of statesmen are brilliantly written; its discussion of political life accurate, dignified, and even noble".

A. L. P. DENNIS.

The World after the Peace Conference, being an Epilogue to the 'History of the Peace Conference of Paris' and a Prologue to the 'Survey of International Affairs, 1920-1923'. By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE. [British Institute of International Affairs.] (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. 91. 5 s.)

Survey of International Affairs, 1920-1923. By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE. [British Institute of International Affairs.] (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xv, 526. Maps. 25 s.)

STUDENTS of contemporary history have already learned the value of the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, edited by Major Temperley for the British Institute of International Affairs, and they will rejoice to learn that the Institute proposes to continue that enterprise by an annual survey of international affairs. The first of the books under review is a kind of connecting link between the *History* and the *Survey*; the *Survey* itself brings together most of the international threads spun since the Peace Conference, and the remainder will be gathered up in the volumes for 1924 and 1925. "Thereafter it is hoped to survey the affairs of each year in an annual volume without arrears." Wherever possible, the narrative is based on published official documents, a full bibliography of which is appended to each of the sections and subsections into which the book is divided; the treatment is sufficiently detailed to satisfy all reasonable needs, yet not so elaborate as to obscure the fundamental issues; and the tone of the writing is so objective, without being colorless, and so judicial, although judgments are frequently rendered, that while no faults are overlooked, no passions are aroused and no just susceptibilities offended. It is indeed fortunate that the book has been entrusted to a writer who possesses a brilliant literary style, a profound grasp of history both ancient and modern, and an amazing power of analysis and comparison, and whose studies are reinforced by some practical experience of diplomacy and much travel in Europe and Asia. In short, the two books are the most

important contributions yet made to the history of post-war Europe, and their prompt publication is a matter for congratulation to both Mr. Toynbee and the British Institute of International Affairs.

The first volume offers a comparison of the world of 1914 and that of 1920 from the point of view of international relations. Before the war Europe was the centre of the international system partly by virtue of its superior military power, but also because it was the most highly organized continent economically. So great was the accumulation of wealth, power, and prestige that it could seemingly afford the luxury of submerged and discontented nationalities, at least so long as the problems presented by them were kept in solution by the Concert of the Great Powers. Unfortunately, because three of the Powers were interested parties, their decisions were dictated not by justice, but by self-interest, and "a conflict, waged between overwhelming material force and an invincible political idea" (p. 23), was, by the course of the war provoked by this conflict, determined in favor of the latter. But not only did the triumph of nationalism destroy the Concert of Europe, thereby depriving Europe of a directing force in her hour of greatest need; the Great Powers themselves had, even before the war, thanks to altered conditions, ceased to be economically independent, and since the war are in many respects less well off than some smaller states. Europe, in short, has degenerated into a "half-derelict continent" (p. 27). In consequence, the advance of Western materialism into the remotest corner of the globe, which seemed irresistible in 1914, has been abruptly challenged by those peoples who appeared to be its inevitable prey. Thus, whereas in 1914 "no completely independent Muslim state was left upon the map" (p. 75), Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan have reasserted themselves, and the end is perhaps not yet reached. No summary, however, can do justice to a penetrating analysis almost every sentence of which gives food for thought.

In the second volume, Mr. Toynbee applies his conclusions to the study of recent diplomacy. After giving some account of the new "organs of international authority and their proceedings", *i.e.*, the inter-allied conferences so dear to Mr. Lloyd George and the sessions of the Council and the Assembly of the League of Nations, he divides the world into five obvious and convenient compartments—western Europe, eastern Europe, the Islamic world, tropical Africa, and the Far East and the Pacific. Each problem is treated separately, from its origin to its settlement, a method which has the disadvantage of making it sometimes difficult for the reader to follow the manœuvres for position upon the European or world diplomatic chessboard, unless Mr. Toynbee himself supplies the key, as he often does. He is often critical of Allied policy, but how well he can hold the balance between fact and fiction is admirably illustrated in the section devoted to the administration of the Saar Basin. The completeness of the book can be gauged from the inclusion of such obscure topics as the status of East Karelia, the status of British subjects in Tunis, and the suppression of slavery in tropical Africa. The principal

treaties are given in appendixes, and there is an adequate complement of maps, together with a good index. It is safe to say that the *Survey* will take its place as the standard work of reference on contemporary international politics.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860.

By PERCY WELLS BIDWELL, Ph.D., and JOHN I. FALCONER, Ph.D., Professor of Rural Economy in Ohio State University. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1925. Pp. xii, 512. Paper, \$4.00; cloth, \$5.00.)

INTO the fabric of this book are woven threads of divers spinning. This is, of course, commonly true in historical treatises, but is peculiarly the case in the present book. The hands that started the work, under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution, did not complete it. Secondary materials, printed and unprinted, as well as primary sources, have been drawn upon. The practice of quoting verbatim the various writings used—pamphlets, journals, reports, and formal treatises—has given the book the appearance of being a compilation. But it is by no means a mere compilation. For a work of description rather than analysis, it has extraordinary interest. The reader is carried on by the simple story of how Americans in the North have obtained a living by soil cultivation and animal husbandry.

Although Professor Falconer has contributed the part on the period 1840-1860, it is Dr. Bidwell, of the United States Tariff Commission, who has been responsible, not only for his own part, 1620-1840, but in a general way for the whole book. This may explain in part the uniformity of treatment. The interest is not so much landholding or rural culture as production. Land, labor, and especially technique are the chief considerations. Chapters are devoted to particular crops and animals. But amid all this minute description, the authors have found space for more synthetic treatment under such headings as trade, pioneering, farm management, and organization of the farmers.

The book is well equipped with maps, charts, drawings, statistical tables, and a bibliography. The inadequacy of the index is all the more serious when one remembers that this is even more a work of reference than a text for continuous reading.

The treatment is almost always objective. Facts are generally allowed to tell their own story. And these facts are so numerous and so pertinent that none can read without learning. One is struck with the great diversity of local conditions even in the North (that part alone is dealt with) and the consequent difficulty of generalizing.

There are many points at which the authors might have indicated analogies with other times and other countries. The immediate European background of American agriculture is not elaborated, or indeed often touched upon. This gives the impression of an independence which American agriculture did not really possess.

The authors have many followers in their philosophy of exploitation. "The facts were that the kind of farming that paid best in the West was exploitation of the soil. It looked like poor farming to an easterner and to a European, but it was the system most profitable to the settlers on the prairies. Land was cheap, fields were large, and the best management was the application of a minimum of labor per acre" (p. 273). This is, of course, the short-time point of view which justifies many kinds of ruthless activity. It is individualism in its most thoughtless mood. Certainly exploitation led to rapid results in New England and New York, while Quebec Province kept its resources and remained backward. But whether we accept or reject the judgment, we should at least note the growing protest against a destruction of resources which many individuals in the name of society and the future now deplore.

It is difficult to accept some arguments. It is said (p. 58) that the "scarcity of labor made separate inclosures impossible, and so they [colonists in New England] very naturally introduced in their new homes the common fields of the old country". Well, the scarcity of labor explains much, but mere imitation of the agricultural system known in the home land explains more in this case, as it seems to the reviewer. In England the system existed amid abundance of labor. In America it was abolished even though labor continued scarce. In other words, there seems to be no correlation between labor scarcity and the common-field system. Any saving of labor in herding livestock would have been lost in cultivating scattered strips in open fields.

Elsewhere (p. 66) it is stated that in New England and in the Middle Colonies "Cheap land made large estates and tenancy as impossible in one section as in the other". But surely there was cheap land in the South, and yet large estates flourished there. The explanation of the difference between the North and the South lies rather in the differences of natural conditions. The North could not produce a large surplus of agricultural products which European consumers needed. In short, there was no chance for development of large units in the North, because there was no brisk assured or continuous demand for the output. European capital and African labor did not go to the North for the cultivation of large estates, because there was scant promise of reward for their owners.

In spite of such probable discrepancies, this book is sure to prove of great use. Every library and every student of American economic history would profit by the possession of this work.

N. S. B. GRAS.

Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, from April, 1704, to February, 1708-9; from February, 1708-9, to March, 1714-5; from March, 1714-5, to October, 1718, preserved in the Public Record Office. Three volumes. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1920, 1924, 1925. Pp. vi, 641; v, 680; 488. 15 s.; £2 2 s. 0 d.; £1 12 s. 6 d.)

MORE than thirty years ago, the late W. Noël Sainsbury, learned and experienced editor of the first five volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, was asked which series in the Public Record Office he considered best worth copying for American use. He replied, without hesitation, the journal of the Board of Trade. No one studying carefully the three volumes that have now been issued, covering the years from 1704 to 1718, will disagree with that opinion or will fail to arise from their perusal with other feeling than one of regret that the earlier minutes, those from 1675 to 1703, are not in a similarly complete and accessible form. The journal in manuscript, either in London or Philadelphia, is not as easy to use as the journal in print, while the entries in the *Calendar* are not only out of place in that series but are so shortened and scattered as to be shorn of much of their value. The journal should have been printed entire from the beginning, including as well such proceedings as remain of the earlier councils for trade and plantations before 1675. These records constitute a complete and indivisible whole, standing to the *Calendar* as do the minutes of any official body stand to the documents that illustrate its activities. They can be properly understood only when read consecutively, line by line, with constant opportunity for reference backward and forward as the reader proceeds. I have been familiar with the journal in manuscript for many years, but I have never got so vivid and accurate an impression of its contents, as I have from following, day by day and week by week, for these twelve years, the business that the board put through.

However lax the board may have become later, particularly after Newcastle was appointed a principal secretary in 1724, there can be no doubt of its efficiency during these years. It sat, so to speak, at the centre of the entire world of British trade and spent days working over treaties of commerce and tariff arrangements with other countries and cities from Muscovy to Venice. Some of the questions that were brought before it were intricate and difficult and frequently involved long hours and much labor. One is not surprised that colonial affairs were often secondary to the more conspicuous business of Continental trade. It became necessary in 1714 to appoint one day, Friday, for the consideration of plantation affairs, and in 1717, after the business required by the treaty of Utrecht was got out of the way, to set apart two days for the plantations in general and one day for plantation laws. In fact, however, almost every day was plantation day, for it must not be forgotten that the colonies as well as the mother country were interested in these Continental negotiations,

and that such a treaty as that with Portugal, for example, here discussed at great length, was of concern to many a colonial merchant and planter. On the day designated for the purpose, the board had long hearings, at which claimants, petitioners, and others, specially summoned to appear, were present in person, often in considerable numbers, and occasionally their debates "continued some hours". The minutes of these hearings are of the highest value as original documents, throwing light on important questions, such as concerned Maryland, Pennsylvania, Nova Scotia, the Palatines, the Royal African Company, the negro trade with Brazil, assembly quarrels in Jamaica and New York, the Newfoundland fishery, the Virginia Indian trade, Thomas Coram's proposed settlement in Maine, and the whole question of marine insurance. We find here the origin of the pamphlets prepared by the colonial merchants, Thomas Banister and Joshua Gee, and published in 1715 and 1729, on the New England trade and on trade in general. In all these matters the board was eminently fair. It insisted that complaints be well grounded. On several occasions it reproved parties appearing before it for lack of caution and for making "frivolous requests, urged with little reason or respect", and more than once dismissed charges against a colonial governor, "there being no proof of the facts therein set forth".

Though the board had no executive powers, its influence in shaping executive action was probably greater than is commonly supposed. The Plantation Office was a workshop in which was prepared material for many important official documents. There were drafted by the board or its secretary hundreds of reports and representations to the king in Council, the very words of which were generally taken over bodily into the final executive order. There also were drawn up many letters to the Secretary of State, the Treasury, the Admiralty, and other departments, with suggestions as to what ought to be done. There also were initiated a few acts of Parliament, bills for which were sometimes drafted by the board itself after long consideration and discussion. And there were revised, if not originated, not a few proclamations, authorized by the King in Council and written in the office of the Secretary of State. Thus we can trace back to the Plantation Office, its board, secretary, and legal adviser, the origin of many state papers and a few acts of Parliament.

As far as these records go to show, the board did not discuss matters of policy or consider underlying principles. Its members were mercantilist in their main points of view and saw no reason to depart from a strict application of mercantilist doctrines which were fixed and needed no discussion. The duty of the members was to apply these doctrines in every matter, large or small, that came before them for consideration and report.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Bering's Voyages: an Account of the Efforts of the Russians to Determine the Relation of Asia and America. By F. A. GOLDER. Volume II. *Steller's Journal of the Sea Voyage from Kamchatka to America and Return on the Second Expedition, 1741-1742.* Translated and in part annotated by Leonhard Stejneger. [American Geographical Society, Research Series, no. 2.] (New York: the Society. 1925. Pp. xi, 291. With vol. I., \$8.00, to libraries \$7.00.)

THE American Geographical Society by initiating a Research Series, of which the present volume is the second issue, is conferring upon students a real service. The history of the earlier explorations of our extreme northwest coast has been treated in numerous volumes in a scattered manner, without reference to the fundamental original records.

These records until lately have been inaccessible to the students of the period, but through the enterprise of the society and the painstaking industry of Mr. F. A. Golder they are now rescued from the Russian archives and made available in the English language.

The volume under review includes a biographical note on Steller, the naturalist and historian of Bering's voyage to the northwest coast of America in 1741-1742, by Golder; a translation of Steller's Journal of the voyage, revised and annotated by Doctor Leonhard Stejneger of the United States National Museum, with reproduction of the ancient maps and of photographs by Dr. Stejneger taken during his visits to Bering Island. A description of the island written by Steller and a letter from him to Gmelin about the voyage are included as appendixes, together with a very complete bibliography and full index to this and the preceding volume which contains a translation of Bering's log-book of the voyage. The editorial work is excellent and worthy of a word of commendation.

It has long been recognized that Bering's expedition suffered greatly from the commander's temperamental inability to enforce discipline, to which age and infirmity largely contributed. In fact, apart from the epoch-making landfall, we are indebted to Steller for almost all the valuable results obtained. The officers of the vessel were indifferently qualified for their work, apparently devoid of curiosity in regard to the characteristics of the new found land or its inhabitants, quarrelling among themselves, and indisposed to assist in Steller's investigations. In spite of all difficulties the latter succeeded in accumulating a respectable amount of valuable material. His account of the winter on Bering Island after the wreck of their vessel and the death of the commander is intensely interesting.

Mr. Golder was extremely fortunate in obtaining the co-operation of Dr. Stejneger, whose repeated visits, long stay on Bering Island, and exceptional qualifications as a naturalist gave him a unique equipment as a commentator on Steller's record.

The fact that not a trace of human occupation previous to the coming of the Russian expedition has ever been discovered on the island is a convincing indication that the theories of the population of America from Asia by way of the Aleutian chain are erroneous. Anyone having experience of this tempestuous and foggy sea would naturally be skeptical of such a theory, which is based merely on a superficial inspection of the map and ignorance of the local conditions.

The hardships, disappointments, and pitiful end of this enthusiastic explorer make us grateful for the publication of his journal in this satisfactory and final form. No better monument could be established to his memory.

WILLIAM H. DALL.

Warren-Adams Letters, being chiefly a Correspondence among John Adams, Samuel Adams, and James Warren. Volume II., 1778-1814. [Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, vol. LXXIII.] (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1925. Pp. xxviii, 474. \$4.00.)

THE first volume of these letters, published in 1917, closed with the year 1777; the second volume continues the letters into the last months of the life of Mercy Warren, whose death brought to an end the correspondence among the Warrens and Adamses which had lasted for more than forty years and during the earlier years of the Revolution had been especially active. The present volume draws, however, upon a source which the first volume did not, and includes the Warren letters found among the Samuel Adams Papers in the New York Public Library, those belonging to the period of this volume being given their chronological place in the volume, while those of earlier dates (thirty-seven in number) have been gathered into an appendix.

There are in all about 270 letters in the volume, of which 84 are from the pen of James Warren and 32 from that of Mercy Warren, his wife, while more than 100 of the letters were written to the one or the other. Chief writer of those in the latter category is John Adams, from whom there are 44 letters scattered through the period, a few of them to Elbridge Gerry, while there are 19 from Abigail Adams, all to Mercy Warren. Samuel Adams, who figures on the title-page as one of the chief correspondents, drops in this volume to a minor place, having only fifteen letters to his credit. During most of this period he was not so far separated from Warren as to call for an interchange of letters.

The letters of John Adams in the volume form an important addition to that statesman's accessible correspondence, particularly his letters relating to the peace negotiations. To James Warren he could unbosom himself as to few others. Nothing, for instance, could have been franker than this from a letter of April 9, 1783: "It is utterly inconceivable how Congress have been deceived into such Instructions as they gave us,

which without all Controversy would have ruined our Country, if they had been obeyed. Those Instructions put some of our essential Interests into the Power of the worst Enemy of those Interests." The letters of Mrs. Adams, whether as the wife of a diplomat in Europe or of the President of the United States, are excellent examples of keen observation from a woman long accustomed to observe and to give voice to her observations.

Among the other prominent personages who appear in these pages, some of them frequently, is Arthur Lee, from whom there are ten letters, most of which are in his characteristic manner, pouring out from his abundant vials of bitterness caustic denunciation upon various and sundry heads, upon the head of Franklin in particular.

In this volume, as in the first, the correspondence centres chiefly around the hearthstone of the Warrens, and it is the lives, characters, and associations of James and Mercy Warren which more than anything else stand intimately revealed. Of James Warren one might from these letters draw a fairly accurate portrait. But what impresses one especially is that this intimate friend and co-worker with the Adamses in the Revolutionary movement should presently have fallen out of political favor and eventually have drifted apart politically from his old comrade, John Adams. He must have spent his later years in deep disappointment. But it is the letters of his wife rather than his own that more particularly reveal this. Doubtless Warren lacked political adaptation. He evidently took himself seriously, although he does not appear to have wholly lacked a sense of humor, as for instance, when in one of his many gibes at Hancock he expresses uncertainty whether the latter's latest attack of gout is political or natural.

It is, however, the correspondence of Mercy Warren which, of the entire content of the volume, possesses the strongest appeal. Keenly interested in the great events enacting about her, she exhibits in her earlier letters an unusual, if nevertheless quite feminine dash and vivacity, even though her rhetoric may be a bit florid to the modern ear and her fondness for classical allusions a bit excessive. But as the years grew upon her her style became more sedate, while her interest in the life about her, political events in particular, never slackened, and the fire in her soul burned unceasingly to the very end.

Here are additional letters in that notable controversy between her and John Adams over her *History of the American Revolution*, wherein that redoubtable statesman found much to criticize. Not all of Adams's thunder was, however, hurled directly upon the head of Mrs. Warren. In a letter to Gerry (April 17, 1813) he pronounces a practical conclusion to the whole matter by exclaiming, "History is not the Province of the Ladies". In a later letter to Gerry (April 26, 1813) he says: "You talk to me at seventy-seven Years of Age of Writing History. If I was only thirty, I would not undertake an History of the Revolution in less than twenty years"; nevertheless he must hasten to set down a few facts before it is too late. The controversy between Adams and Mrs. Warren

had reached a degree of bitterness, but as the two approached the evening of life the reconciliation appears to have been complete, and their ancient friendship was revived in an exchange of letters reminiscent of the early days of the Revolution in which they had each borne an important part. One can without hesitancy agree with the editor, Dr. Worthington C. Ford, that this collection of letters is unsurpassed by any single correspondence of the period in value and richness.

E. C. B.

The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota. By PAUL R. FOSSUM, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XLIII., no. 1.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1925. Pp. 180. \$1.50.)

THIS study, scholarly in parts, is marred by special pleading. No chance is lost to slur the farmer. He "is always ready", we are assured, "to reform everybody and every thing but his own business"—a statement susceptible perhaps of even wider application, supported here by a digression on the farmer's reprehensible inclination to vote for prohibition. Page 13 explains that the grain-buying interests eliminated competition "so that they might enjoy a reasonable [!] profit on their business". The story of the refusal of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce to permit the Minnesota Farmers' Exchange to use the membership it had bought is wholly partizan and misleading. So, too, of the more vehement account of North Dakota's strange inability to sell her Elevator and Mill bonds at a critical moment. The entrance of that state into the milling and elevator business is told with lavish use of the epithet "Socialism", and the adverse Minnesota court decision in a like case is quoted against it. But the later and vital decision of the Federal Supreme Court, upholding the Dakota enterprises, is glossed over (page 123) with only one incidental and indefinite reference, absolutely meaningless to a reader not already informed.

These are random instances. Pages 89-92 carry a long digression leading to the insinuation that George Loftus, a Minnesota leader now dead, sought dishonorably to defeat the North Dakota Elevator project while pretending to favor it. No scintilla of evidence is cited—merely vague inference. No one who knew George Loftus will ever believe the charge. It was never more than a rancorous rumor launched during a political contest of almost unrivalled ferocity in the vain hope of disrupting the farmer party. Yet this volume first elaborates the wild accusation into a feeble semblance of argument, and then, a little later (page 94), refers to it again as though it were a fact undisputed and indisputable!

Dr. Fossum does see some unreason, at times, in the attitude of business interests toward the League; but always he finds excuse for them. The "mud-slinging tactics" of Mr. Loftus, he tells us, had naturally "ali-

enated" them from any movement with which he was connected. So, doubtless, the author was assured by representatives of those interests. (Twelve of the thirteen informants to whom he returns thanks in his preface rank under that head.) But did his researches never bring him in touch with Æsop's wolf, so justly alienated from the lamb that had roiled the stream by drinking below him? Dr. Fossum holds it axiomatic that no agrarian organization can be successful "unless it abstains entirely from politics". The armed highwayman, he might be reminded, is always gratified to have an intended victim advised to leave pistols at home.

When not enlivened by reminiscence of forceful vituperation from old columns of the *Bismarck Tribune* or the *Grand Forks Herald*, the style of the book is thoroughly bad. One thirteen-line sentence (page 59) scatters 143 words among ten different clauses of all sorts and ranks; and many a short sentence is less clear and less grammatical. There is an unusually poor index and many excellent plates with quantitative graphs and charts.

WILLIS MASON WEST.

Die Kunst der Massenbeeinflussung in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Von FRIEDRICH SCHÖNEMANN. (Stuttgart, Berlin, and Leipzig: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1924. Pp. 212. 6 M.)

PROFESSOR SCHÖNEMANN had a rare opportunity to do a very enlightening study. His book, however, by limiting itself to the United States, loses something in value. Further, his wide knowledge of the war activities of the United States is tinged apparently by the bitterness of one who was compelled to listen in silence while his own people were frequently made the target of unrestrained denunciation. Further, his book has a practical purpose. The Germans, in his opinion, wholly unpolitical and void of any idea of propaganda, must be shown how necessary propaganda is, how justifiable it is to proclaim as truth what is truth to you and not split hairs about alternate or opposing opinions. Waiving any controversy about German skill in propaganda in recent years or the activities of the Navy League, one feels like commending to Professor Schönemann the many-volumed publications of Moritz Busch or Bismarck with their revelations of the chancellor's relations with the press. Indifference to other nations' views and opinions is a doctrine of as doubtful value to post-war Germany as it is to post-war America. And two things trouble the author so insistently that he sees them at every turn. The first is England. It is apparently an unfair advantage in the war of propaganda that we read English literature and speak a language that we (except H. L. Mencken, much quoted by Professor Schönemann) call English. We read the Bible and Shakespeare in English and venerate the Magna Carta. England and her ruling classes control our civilization and culture. Northcliffe dominates our press and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is a great piece of British propaganda. In all fairness, a

former resident of a suburb of Boston ought to have noted some exceptions to this all-embracing English dominance even if he did not consider the sensibilities of William Randolph Hearst and the Sears-Roebuck Company. But eighty pages later he emancipates us from England by declaring that any opinion that we are a dependency of England in an economic or political or cultural sense is false.

The other *bête noir* of Professor Schönmann is the Committee on Public Information. Like King Charles's head in Mr. Dick's manuscript, it intrudes itself into every chapter of the book and is given one all to itself in conclusion. The American Defense Society and the National Security League he disposes of chiefly by quoting Mr. Creel's sharp criticisms of their methods and purposes. The author, although naturally unhappy about any presentation of Germany from the American point of view, seems most aroused by the success of the Committee's work. Although he questions some of the statements in Mr. Creel's book *How We Advertised America* on the cost of German propaganda, he does not get beyond exclamation-points and harsh adjectives in refutation. He evidently thinks President Wilson's notes to Germany represent over a year of propaganda in preparation for the organized work of the Committee—a truly German interpretation of the famous notes and of the rather haphazard way in which the Committee developed its functions.

The author's basic thesis is that no nation can successfully make propaganda in its best sense that is not optimistic about its future. The United States is pre-eminently the land of optimism. It is therefore the land where propaganda succeeds. In successive chapters the author discusses schools, church, press, women, movies, and the many social, business, and political clubs and societies in the United States. There is in these chapters a good deal of information and some very keen comment. Parallels are constantly drawn with Germany, but the lessons both for Germany and for America will probably fail in their work because of the querulous and unsympathetic tone in which both nations are treated. Optimism is perhaps too much to expect of Professor Schönmann in the circumstances, but he himself has laid it down as the essential for successful propaganda and in this book he should not forget that he was a propagandist for a new type of political thinking in Germany. If he fails he should be the first to know why.

GUY STANTON FORD.

The Quebec Act: a Study in Statesmanship. By R. COUPLAND, Beit Professor of Colonial History in the University of Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. iii, 224. 10 s. 6 d.)

THE purpose of this volume is to explain how it happened that the Colony of Quebec, then recently acquired by conquest, refused to join the southern colonies in revolt against Britain. The secret of Canada's attachment to the Empire is found in the wise and generous statesmanship of Guy Carleton as manifested in the Quebec Act.

The author surveys the more important features of the administration of General Murray, directing particular attention to his conciliatory attitude towards the new French subjects. A tendency is detected to overestimate the racial factor as a cause of dissension in the colony in the years immediately following the conquest. Within the British community there were as ardent disputes as between English and French. Murray's local unpopularity was caused quite as much by his regulation of commerce and by his granting of trade concessions to a particular English group as by his friendliness with the French, though naturally the latter allegation received greater publicity because of its appeal to national sentiments and prejudices.

As Professor Coupland very properly indicates, Carleton was one of the first to realize the significance of the rumbling in the southern colonies and determined that Canada should remain faithful to Britain. Because of climatic conditions, he estimated quite incorrectly, Englishmen would not permanently settle in the St. Lawrence valley. The few English traders in the colony he regarded as wholly undesirable, forgetful of the fact that many of them had rendered excellent service in the provisioning of the British armies in the conflict with France. The promotion of their commercial interests did not appeal to him as either necessary or prudent. On the other hand, the French Canadians, a thoroughly docile people, as he erroneously conceived them, must, barring a catastrophe, remain the dominant race in Canada. Hence, he argued, Canada could be held by granting the demands of the French Canadians.

In the interpretation of their demands, however, Carleton was supremely mistaken. He saw the French Canadian through the glasses of the seigneur and the priest. Carleton failed to realize that the new-world movement aiming at political and intellectual emancipation was not confined to the English colonies and that even before the conquest there was a significant restiveness among the French Canadians which, with a change of masters, threatened to break asunder all traditional restraints. There were those, more, one suspects, than the author is inclined to admit, who refused to pay tithes to the priest or his accustomed dues to the seigneur. Carleton, in the Quebec Act, accomplished the virtual establishment of the Church, by which the habitant was compelled to pay tithes, and the introduction of the old French civil law, which revived certain burdensome features of the seigniorial system which had begun to disappear. Contrary to the advice of his chief justice and his attorney general, and in response to no popular demand, he replaced English commercial law by the French law, thus creating intolerable conditions for the English commercial interests. Is it then surprising that more French Canadians served with the American than with the British forces or that Montreal, the commercial centre, surrendered to the invaders without resistance? Abundant evidence of Carleton's errors of judgment is contained in this volume, but the author seemingly shrinks from the conclusions to which it clearly points. Carleton's policy did not conciliate the habitant; it did

alienate the commercial interests, and by delivering Montreal to the invaders seriously imperilled British supremacy in Canada. Canada was not saved by the Quebec Act but in spite of it.

D. McARTHUR.

MINOR NOTICES

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1920. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1925, pp. 335.) This volume gives in detail the proceedings of the Association during the year 1920, including the report of its annual meeting at Washington in December of that year, the proceedings of the sixteenth annual conference of historical societies, mainly occupied with consideration of the compilation of war records by state organizations, and the proceedings of a conference on economic history held during the course of the annual meeting. This material is followed, in the second half of the volume, by full or abbreviated texts of some fourteen papers read at the annual meeting, among which we may especially mention those of Professor Rostovtzeff on the Origin of the Russian State on the Dnieper, of Professor Dutcher on the Enlightened Despotism, of Professor Clive Day on Capitalistic and Socialistic Tendencies in the Puritan Colonies, of Professor L. M. Sears on Philadelphia and the Embargo of 1808, and of Professor Rodney C. True on the Early Development of Agricultural Societies in the United States.

Movements in European History. By D. H. Lawrence. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. xiii, 354, maps, 8 s.) The book presents a topical treatment of some phases of European history. Sometimes a chapter deals with a movement, sometimes with part of a movement, and sometimes with a movement and some other things. Some very important European movements are not touched. The chapter on Christianity sketches the progress of Christianity and of the papacy to about 500. The chapter on the Crusades treats of the underlying conditions of the crusading movement, develops the first crusade in some detail, and touches the later crusades lightly. The chapter on the Reformation traces the Lutheran movement in Germany to about 1555. The chapter on Prussia deals with several things. The evolution of Prussia in its territorial, militaristic, economic, and political aspects is well done. In this same chapter, incidental to an account of Frederick the Great comes a general treatment of the system of eighteenth-century benevolent despotism, and incidental to the German War of liberation comes the only account of the Napoleonic régime. There are good chapters on German and on Italian unification, but the wider movement for national unity as it affected Greeks, Serbs, Poles, Belgians, and in fact all Europeans is not handled. There are no chapters on the rise of medieval towns, on the commercial revolution, on the Industrial Revolution on the Continent, on the struggle for political liberty for the individual, or on the advance of democracy. The account is not concerned with Russia, Scandinavia, the Low Countries, or the Balkans.

The style is well adapted to the task. The interest of the reader is during a large part of the time swept along as if by the surge of the movement described. However, occasionally, in the effort to make a complex thing seem simple or a theory impressive, words and statements are used that should have been qualified. There are fierce men, fierce castles, and fierce little steeds. At one time man had been exterminated in Gaul. Charlemagne was a learned man. Only bishops and clergy kept their souls clear and their minds strong. The one characteristic of the Romans was their capacity to co-operate, that of the Germans their separatistic instincts for individual liberty. The two could never mix (p. 51), yet they do mix (p. 68). When the capital was moved to Constantinople the real light of culture was removed and left Western Europe to face the Dark Ages. Christianity alone kept hope alive.

The book will be useful in high schools for collateral reading on the topics treated.

A. L. KOHLMEIER.

A Study of War. By Admiral Sir Reginald Custance, G.C.B., K.C.M.G., C.V.O. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, [1925], pp. ix, 214, \$3.50.) The purpose of the author is to deduce a theory of war which will reconcile the political and military points of view in the conduct of great operations.

In every war the question at issue is of some real or imaginary right upon which the security and interests of each nation are thought to depend. Hence security may be said, in general terms, to be the political object of the war. To statesmen and military men alike the war presents a military problem. In the solution of this problem the military aim of each side is to destroy in battle, or to dishearten and weaken, the opposing armed force, including its directing will, while sparing its own.

It is not always possible to destroy the enemy armed force in battle. In the event that it is not it may still be possible to neutralize it by threatening battle, or postponing battle, or evading battle until more favorable conditions prevail. To destroy or to neutralize the enemy armed force is designated by the author as the Military Aim.

Wars are prolonged by the errors of statesmen and military and naval men who think in terms of the political object and overlook what should be the primary military aim, by which alone the political object may be secured. At the opening of war and when new situations arise, the national or political object is often placed at the forefront, with the result that the military aim is imperilled, and the last thing thought of is success in battle. It cannot be expected that the majority of men, whether lay or professional, will ever understand that in war security is dependent upon destroying or neutralizing the enemy armed force. The military aim, battle, and the political object, security, are confused together and the lay mind concentrates on the thing to be defended. Hence the tendency to await attack and to multiply defenses in every conceivable direction.

One of the author's illustrations will make this clear. When Bonaparte was preparing for his Egyptian expedition, the British Admiralty sent long letters to the Earl of St. Vincent, commanding on the Spanish coast, enumerating the places to be defended and the political responsibilities of the British navy. The old admiral responded by sending young Horatio Nelson into the Mediterranean with thirteen ships with directions "to take, sink, burn, or destroy" the French expedition. These were the orders under which Nelson was acting when he gained his great victory in the Battle of the Nile. Nothing was said about protecting Naples or the political responsibilities of the British navy. If war cabinets could have a St. Vincent to reconcile the political object and the military aim, and a Nelson to pursue the military aim, there would be no occasion for the present work. It cannot be too often stated that the primary military aim of the army and the navy is to destroy or neutralize the enemy armed force in battle in order to attain the political object, security.

S. C. VESTAL.

Piracy in the Ancient World: an Essay in Mediterranean History. By Henry A. Ormerod, Professor of Greek in the University of Leeds. (Liverpool, University Press; London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1924, pp. 286, 10 s. 6 d.) Professor Ormerod's history of ancient piracy begins appropriately with a series of anecdotes from seventeenth-century buccaneering in which the English, Turks, Spaniards, and Moors vie in illustrating the human frailties that are wont to create sea-rovers. He ends equally picturesquely with a few pages on the pirates in ancient fiction. The rest of the book is a review of the obscure trivialities of irregular warfare carried on beyond the horizon of ruling empires. One sees how in the early days the adventuring trader falls into the temptation of making quick gains when out of reach of laws. It was only when the Athenians—who had to depend upon maritime trade for a livelihood—found means to safeguard their sea-routes that regularity of conduct became as much a necessity on sea as on land, and in consequence a more respectable moral code spread over the Aegean Sea. When Athens fell and it was found that her successor, Sparta, concerned herself little about trade and safe waters, the sea-rover came back. For brief periods the Ptolemies and the Rhodians took up the task of policing in as far as the profits of trade seemed commensurate with the cost. To that extent maritime morals were proportioned to some one's interests.

The second century was perhaps the most profitable period for piracy. Then the Ptolemaic dynasty had become futile, the fleet of Antiochus, which he had misused against his neighbors, had been destroyed by Rome, and Rhodes had lost much of her commerce to the traders who gathered at the free port of Delos. So the guard-ships disappeared, while Rome established none in their place, since she cared not a fig for trade and traders. The buccaneers came back in swarms, and near the end of the

century found a good patron in Mithradates, who found it cheaper to hire pirates than to build a fleet of his own. In 103 B.C. the Roman knights who gathered the produce-stipend in Asia found their routes threatened and so brought pressure upon the Senate to clear the seas. Antonius accomplished the task quickly, and the Senate made a province of Cilicia which was the home of the more successful raiders. But when Rome, engaged in the social and first civil wars, had to draw in her guards, Mithradates again lured the pirates out. In 67, Pompey was ordered, by a bill which the knights forced through the assembly, to complete the unfinished task. From that time till the Empire began to fall Rome's permanent fleet kept the Mediterranean safe. But that Roman policy was on the whole guided by military rather than by commercial interests is proved by the fact that on the Red Sea, where her officials had no occasion to sail, the Arabic pirates still enjoyed open seas.

In an appendix, p. 242, Professor Ormerod neatly sums up his arguments against the strange contention of Cuq that the inscription on the Delphic base is a copy of the Gabinian Law of 67 B.C. As for the rest, the book has little that is new or of importance.

TENNEY FRANK.

An Introduction to Church History: a Book for Beginners. By the Reverend Peter Guilday, Ph.D., Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America. (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Company, 1925, pp. vii, 350, \$2.00.) Dr. Guilday as professor of church history in the Catholic University of America is accustomed to give an advanced course in church history which covers three years. To assist students not able to take the work of the first year with him he has prepared this book. It is not a church history, but an introduction to historical study. Even the hastiest glance reveals the fact that the author is well acquainted with the leading discussions of his subject, for though Bernheim is constantly in his mind, he has availed himself of the works of many, whether or not ecclesiastical confrères. He places himself along with Stubbs, Collins, George, Delehaye, Freeman, Langlois, Vincent, and others of the same good company. The author is a consistent Roman Catholic and never lets the reader forget that fact. At the same time he is a man of true historical spirit with a keen eye for fearless criticism. One might have much to say as to the correctness of a sketch of the interpretation of history (chap. II., pp. 48-94), and it might at first seem a rhapsody rather than a scientific discussion. A chapter entitled "The Mission of the Catholic Historian" (chap. VI.) the author delivered as a presidential address in 1924 before the American Catholic Historical Association. It seems truculent and out of place in a work of scientific spirit. It detracts from the general usefulness of the book, although it may help to introduce the book to favorable attention in some quarters. But apart from these two chapters, the book is well written and contains the essential information. Coming whence it does, the work with its fearless-

ness and frankness will be a stimulus and help to many students. It shows, for example, that criticism of a fulsome piece of hagiography is not an attack upon the reputation of a saint, but upon a document written by an incompetent person. There is much more of the same sort of sound common-sense and useful historical suggestions. The writer makes it perfectly clear that there is no sense in trying to gloss over discreditable episodes, persons, and even whole periods in the long life of the Church, though one is a little reminded by the zeal of the writer in this matter of the conversion of the Jew as told by Boccaccio. In short, the book makes it clear that one can be thoroughly abreast of the latest historical methods, apply them without reserve, and be loyal to one's church, and that the sentiment that the "appeal to history is treason" does not spring of faith. One ventures to suggest that these lessons are valuable also to others than the members of the communion to which Dr. Guilday belongs and for which he has rendered excellent service in this convenient book.

JOS. CULLEN AYER.

The Story of the Church: an Outline of its History from the End of the First to the End of the Nineteenth Century. By Charles M. Jacobs, Professor of Church History in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. (Philadelphia, United Lutheran Publication House, 1925, pp. 418, \$2.00.) This book has the limitations of any attempt to compress the history of eighteen centuries into four hundred pages. It is doubtful whether the layman gets more than a hazy impression of the whole from such a sketch, and it offers to the scholar nothing except a plan of treatment. Yet there is a certain value in a balanced narrative which emphasizes essentials, and in a genetic interpretation of the whole subject. The book by Professor Jacobs deserves commendation in these respects. The continuity of the story is kept prominent, especially in the diffused history of the post-Reformation period; the significant facts in each period are thrown into relief and grouped helpfully. Here and there are particularly well-phrased sentences, as on page 155, "The Church was no longer a supernational institution under a head who was the superior of all kings, but a federation of national churches, each of which was ruled in some degree by its own temporal government".

The book might serve well as an introductory guide for study groups, voluntarily undertaking to broaden their information. Others than Lutherans would wish that the author had given somewhat less space to the Lutheran revolt and more to the phases of the Reformation in the other countries that also were vitally affected. Particularly does it seem as if most of the story of Scandinavia could have been omitted to advantage, and more than a single chapter allotted to church history in America. It is easy to overlook the significance of the rapid growth of free churches on this continent, their achievements in liberty and democracy, and such prominent interests as missions and education. No story of the Church,

however brief, is complete without more than mere mention of a few characteristics of the American churches.

The writing of this book, like most church histories, is still of the conventional sort. The "new history" has not made a deep impression upon most of the authorities. The whole subject needs revision in method of treatment, more consideration of such factors as geographical and social environment, secular thought, and group psychology. It is time for a shifting of emphasis, for a recognition of the complexity of factors that belong to any period, achieved however without losing sight of religion as the controlling factor. Perhaps a fresh attempt which would modernize the treatment of the history of religion, so widely misunderstood, would attract the attention that the subject deserves but so grudgingly receives from the general historian.

HENRY K. ROWE.

A Student's Manual of English Constitutional History. By Dudley Julius Medley, Professor of History in the University of Glasgow. Sixth edition. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1925, pp. xxiv, 688, 21 s.) The new edition contains extensive changes. In the introduction the description of the characteristics of the English constitution benefits by consideration of Lowell's views, and the discussion of the theories of origin is also reorganized to advantage. In the second chapter Liebermann, Adams, Baldwin, Tout, Pollard, Turner, and others have been drawn upon to produce a story of witan, Norman curia regis, king's council, cabinet, household, and administration which is almost entirely new. In chapter III. the jurisdiction of the House of Lords receives the light of recent research and the early history of the House of Commons is rewritten under the guidance chiefly of Pasquet and Pollard. In chapter VI. "the contest for sovereign power" previous to the Stuarts is recast. Elsewhere there are numerous alterations of detail. These are the result partly of recent investigations and partly of actual changes made in the constitution since 1913. The revision is not complete. Some important researches, such as McIlwain's, seem to have escaped the author's attention, and some that he cites have not been utilized fully. But the greater part of the most important discoveries made in the field since the date of the fifth edition yield material for the sixth, and the usefulness of this standard manual is increased accordingly.

W. E. LUNT.

Miscellanea Hagiographica Hibernica: Vitae adhuc Ineditae Sanctorum Mac Creiche Naile Cranat. Ad Fidem Codicum Manu Scriptorum recognovit Prolegomenis Notis Indicibus instruxit Carolus Plummer, apud Dunelmenses in Sacra Theologia, apud Dublinienses in Litteris Honoris Causa Doctor. [Subsidia Hagiographica, 15.] (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1925, pp. 288.) The present volume may be regarded as an *addendum* to the two masterly collections which appeared under the same

editorship at Oxford in 1910 and 1922, viz., *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, two volumes, consisting of lives written in Latin, and *Bethada Náem nÉrenn*, two volumes, consisting of lives written in Irish. To the latter class belong the three lives, of MacCreiche, Naile, and Cranat, contained in these miscellanies.

Their literary value is of the slightest: they are dull, monotonous, dry, and dreary, and the translation, which keeps close to the Irish, is consequently, both as a work of edification and as literature, no more interesting than the original. Their importance, which is great, consists in the many precise indications they furnish of the social life and manners of the medieval Irish and in their contribution to hagiological folk-lore. The pagan element, as in most Irish works of the kind, is strong, and here and there one comes across reminiscences of the Irish epic. The most interesting incident narrated occurs in the Life of Saint Cranat (pp. 160-166), who, we are told, in order to avoid matrimony, gouged out her eyes and her sight was miraculously restored to her. To the parallel instances of the "Sacrifice of the Eyes", cited on page 158, may be added those from the Páli, translated by E. W. Burlingame, in chapter XVI. of his *Buddhist Parables* (New Haven, 1922).

The book, like all of the editor's work, shows careful editing, and the correctness of the Irish text, the exactness of the translation, and the abundance of notes leave little to be desired. Yet a few remarks of a grammatical nature, such as on the presence of an infixed pronoun in *rod ainic* and *rom ainic* (page 14) and on unusual expressions, such as *psalm-ghabhail a psalm, ibid.*, might well have been added.

But it is with the "Tentative Catalogue of Irish Hagiology" which occupies nearly one-half of the book, that the learned editor has rendered inestimable services to more than one branch of historical science. The catalogue includes both published and inedited lives and gives some idea of the immense amount of Irish material still existing only in manuscript. Instead of dividing the lives into six sections, however, the list would be much easier for purposes of reference if all the lives, whether in Latin or in Irish and whether of Irish or of non-Irish saints, were arranged alphabetically in one list under the names of the saints. The same remark applies to the three indexes of places and persons.

JOSEPH DUNN.

La Provence au Moyen Age: Histoire Politique, l'Eglise, les Institutions, 1112-1481. Par V.-L. Bourrilly, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres d'Aix, et Raoul Busquet, Archiviste en Chef des Bouches-du-Rhône. (Marseille, Barlatier; Paris, Édouard Champion, 1924, pp. 464, 40 f.) This is a difficult book to review and appraise fairly. It is published without preface or introduction or other explanation, except for the following brief line which appears on the title-page: "Extrait du Tome II. des *Bouches-du-Rhône, Encyclopédie Départementale.*" This, it appears, is a departmental encyclopedia in course of publication

by a Marseilles firm, in sixteen volumes, of which about half have already appeared, covering the modern history of the department, its physical geography, its population, its intellectual life, its biography, and its commerce. Evidently *La Provence au Moyen Age* is a separate publication of a part of volume II. of this departmental encyclopedia, and this fact must account for its plan and limitations. There is no attempt at a comprehensive treatment of the whole subject even for the period between the dates named in the title; but within the accepted limitations the treatment is both thoroughgoing and scholarly. Beginning abruptly with the accession of the house of Barcelona, the first seven chapters comprise a compact narrative of the political history of Provence until it passed by the will of Charles of Maine under the direct rule of the King of France. These are followed by two chapters of a much more summary character, which describe the vicissitudes of the Provençal church from the Gregorian reform movement through the age of the Great Schism and the Councils. These in turn are followed by seven substantial chapters, dealing systematically with successive periods in the development of institutions. It is here that the authors are at their best, and these chapters constitute the most valuable part of the book. The last chapter contains a summary (and, as the authors are careful to say, "provisional") but very interesting and informative description of the economic life of the country, of the conduct of agriculture, industry, and commerce. Almost no attention is paid to social history, strictly so called. This was to be expected in view of the fact that another volume of the series is entitled *La Population*; but it does not appear why a section should be devoted to commerce, in view of the fact that another whole volume in the series is given over to that subject.

This is a volume which ought to be most often used as a work of reference; and yet it contains no index and no formal bibliography, though there is a full table of contents, and much bibliographical information is packed into its copious foot-notes. The work is unadorned by striking features of style, and is far from easy reading. In appearance it is a masterpiece of typography, though it contains a number of typographical errors.

The foregoing criticisms are not intended to depreciate the high quality of much of the work which this volume contains. The authors are competent scholars who have based their work upon the primary materials, especially upon unpublished documents in the archives, and they have written with a fulness of knowledge which no one before them possessed.

Travaux de la Semaine d'Histoire du Droit Normand tenue à Jersey du 24 au 27 Mai 1923, avec le Concours de la Société des Gens de Droit de Jersey, de la Société Jersiaise, et de la Société d'Histoire du Droit Normand, sous la Présidence de Sir W. Venables Vernon, Bailli de Jersey, et de M. E. Pilon, Doyen de la Faculté de Droit de Caen. (Caen,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—23.

A. Olivier, 1925, pp. xiv, 418.) For some years past the Law Faculty of the University of Caen has organized an annual conference on the history of Norman law, attended by a goodly number of lawyers and historians. Part of the week's session is devoted to a systematic explanation of some phase of early Norman law, the remainder to various historical papers. In 1923 the conference was most appropriately held at Jersey, where more of Norman law survives than in Normandy itself. For the Channel Islands were untouched by the Statute of Tenures of 1660; the king still receives personal homage from his military tenants; and the student of medieval institutions may still find here knights' fees and serjeanties, feudal courts and boon days and other vestiges of the feudal age. Several of these survivals are illustrated in the present volume. There are also some specifically Norman studies on topics such as the right of patronage and the origin of the assize *utrum*. The most considerable portion is a systematic discussion of the protection of family property in the Norman *coutume* by MM. Astoul, Bidrey, and Génestal. The essays are of unequal value, but the level is high and some utilize unpublished sources, so that the volume as a whole deserves the attention of Anglo-American students. The whole enterprise reflects credit on the French school of legal history, and particularly upon that active investigator of Norman law, Monsieur R. Génestal.

C. H. H.

La Música Andaluza Medieval. A third fascicle has now appeared of Professor Julián Ribera's study of the development of popular music in medieval Europe, *La Música Andaluza Medieval* (Madrid, Maestre, 1925, pp. 64 of text, 68 of music). In it he passes from the troubadours and the trouvères to the minnesingers and applies his discoveries and methods of interpretation to ninety songs from the Jena Liederhandschrift, twenty-five of which are harmonized. This hypothesis means that a direct connection can be traced from the music of ancient Greece to medieval German music through Byzantium, Persia, the Muslim civilization, and, especially, the Moors in southern Spain. This is part, as Professor Ribera points out in a most interesting and humorous introduction, of a broad proof on which for many years he and Professor Asín have been engaged, of a deep-going and wide influence of the civilization of Islam on medieval Christendom, and this thesis is now accepted by nearly all Orientalists as proven. The difficulty still lies in persuading European medievalists.

The Reformation in Poland: some Social and Economic Aspects. By Paul Fox, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XLII., no. 4.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1924, pp. 153, \$1.50.) The present work does not profess to give a history of the Polish Reformation, but simply to emphasize some social and economic aspects of it. Leaving religious factors quite out of account,

it maintains the thesis that the revolt from Rome in Poland was at bottom an economic and social struggle of the nobles against the clergy. The work is based chiefly on writings of Polish scholars since 1850, which are extensively cited; but it betrays no acquaintance with such a prime source-book as Lubieniecius's *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*, nor of the works of such German or French scholars as Berge, Koniecki, Krause, and Wotschke. With considerable repetition, and a certain confusion of material, raising the question how fully he has mastered his subject, the author brings forward a good deal in support of his contention. He ignores, however, the significant fact that many of both laity and clergy had, quite independently of economic causes, seriously revolted against the teachings, practices, and moral corruption current in the Church, and this in many cases where there was economically and socially little to gain and much to lose by changes of allegiance, and that this revolt still persisted after the tide of advantage was all against the Reformers. It may still be doubted, therefore, whether more may justly be said than that social and economic factors supplied an additional incentive and a welcome and powerful support to a movement which had its springs elsewhere, and even when most affected by the factors named was at its heart moral and spiritual. The author has, however, done a useful service in marshalling and emphasizing the economic and social factors in the movement, and in thus paving the way to a fuller recognition of their influence.

The work is marred by a few minor defects. Slips in unfamiliar Polish orthography need not be mentioned, though geographical names are not consistently given in their proper form (Cracow, Posen, Gnesen). It was Catharine wife of Melchior Weygel (not C. Zalasowska, her maiden name, p. 33) that was burned at Kraków in 1539. Francesco Stancaro (rather than Stankar, p. 43, etc.) was heretical on the Atonement rather than on the Trinity. The date of the Racovian Catechism (p. 73) was 1605 rather than 1575, and it was not the work of Czechowicz (*sic*). The correct forms of the following names (pp. 73, 81 f., 101, etc.) are Lelio and Fausto Sozzini (not Socino) unless one prefers a Latin form, Gregory Paulus (not Pauli as often given), Gentile (rather than Gentilis), Schmalz (not Smalz), Tarnów (not Tarnov).

EARL MORSE WILBUR.

Studies in English Commerce and Exploration in the Reign of Elizabeth. I. *England and Turkey: the Rise of Diplomatic and Commercial Relations*, by Albert Lindsay Rowland. II. *The English Search for a Northwest Passage in the Time of Queen Elizabeth*, by George Born Manhart. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1924, pp. xviii, 189; v, 179, \$2.50.) These two doctorate theses have many common points of interest and suggest the same general criticisms. They are both valuable in providing in convenient form chapters on certain aspects of Elizabethan history. Mr. Rowland's is the more interesting study, as he

succeeds in giving a good synthetic view of the neglected history of the Turkey Company and of Anglo-Turkish relations in the reign of Elizabeth. His work is conscientious and painstaking and will be useful not only to economic historians but to students of Elizabethan foreign policy in which Turkey was a makeweight against Spain, and to students of British policy in later centuries. Mr. Manhart's thesis gathers up the well-known but broken story of the English sixteenth-century search for a northwest passage.

Neither thesis can be wholly called a contribution to knowledge. Mr. Rowland draws heavily from Hakluyt, the Domestic, Venetian, and Turkish State Papers, the Lansdowne and Cecil manuscripts—material with which every student of Tudor history is familiar. On the other hand, he has widened his sources from less well-known collections. The same criticism applies on the whole to Mr. Manhart. Indeed, we found nothing in his pages at all unfamiliar, except a belief which we do not share in Stefansson's exploded theory that "men from temperate zones can comfortably spend a winter in the far north" (p. 157). The material which Mr. Manhart uses is well known and the greater part of it is already in print.

Both theses seem to suggest that they are rather meant to be contributions to scholarship. We can hardly think that they are successful. There are no new interpretations, no important difficulties approached and solved. There is no preface to either giving any explanations of why or how or where the work was done. We are somewhat at sea, and we only know that the theses represent demands from the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. Each thesis leaves the impression of a *tour de force*. Mr. Rowland's is inconceivably dull, with long interminable quotations from Hakluyt. Mr. Manhart writes much better, but he too appears at times to toil wearily at his oar. The books will be useful as convenient works of reference. The indexes are fairly adequate and the bibliographies are honest in that each writer has made use of the material referred to in them, and has scorned to compile a list of authorities from some library catalogue—*o si sic omnes!* We presume the spellings with which we are unfamiliar are the latest product of scientific English. We are content, in our ignorance, to accept them as such.

W. P. M. KENNEDY.

British Diplomatic Instructions, 1689-1789. Vol. II., France, 1689-1721. Edited for the Royal Historical Society, by L. G. Wickham Legg, Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. (London, the Society, 1925, pp. xxxviii, 212.) The first volume of this valuable series, that for Sweden, 1689-1727, was reviewed in these pages three years ago (XXVIII. 355). The more important relations with France receive great illustration from the present volume and from Mr. Legg's extended introduction. The warning is repeated that the formal instructions to the British am-

bassadors and envoys in foreign capitals in that period have nothing like the importance which attached to the elaborate instructions issued to their agents by the French court. The instructions, strictly so called, were conventional forms; the substance of these volumes is the despatches of the Secretaries of State to ambassadors to France or to the Congress of Utrecht. Material elsewhere printed is in general omitted. That which is here presented is derived from the Public Record Office. To save space, correspondence illustrating the progress of negotiations over colonial questions, which would be especially interesting to American students, has mostly been omitted; but one brief instruction toward the commercial treaty of 1713 and those given in 1719 to Daniel Pulteney and Martin Bladen as commissaries to arrange boundaries under the Utrecht Treaty are given in an appendix. The editing includes excellent introductory accounts of each ambassador or envoy.

La France Économique et Sociale au XVIII^e Siècle. Par Henri Sée, Professeur à l'Université de Rennes. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1925, pp. 193, 6 fr.) This brief but admirable summary of the results of the more recent studies upon eighteenth-century France, written by a scholar who has been a notable contributor to them, deserves a place near Professor Marion's *Dictionnaire des Institutions de la France au XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècle*, which has already become an indispensable book of reference. As the title suggests, the author examines conditions under the old régime with economic phenomena for his guide in analysis and classification. He believes it more rational to study the population of France as affected by different forms of property, rural, urban, industrial, and commercial, than as classified by mere juridical status; pointing out, for example, the many distinct groups within the single class of the third estate. He does not ignore the familiar classification, but looks at it from the economic point of view. Accordingly, he begins with landed property and immediately afterwards deals with the peasants and agriculture. Then follow the clergy and the nobles, who possess pre-eminent rights over rural property. He studies a group like the judges, although they have no special relation to landed property, and passes on to the trades and commerce. Here he notes the small beginnings of capitalistic production discernible before the Revolution. In dealing with the peasants he makes the interesting remark that the persistence of the seigniorial régime may have contributed to the consolidation of peasant property which had gradually established itself under the cover of villein tenures. The fact that the peasants continued to pay a *cens* did not make them any the less proprietors. His estimate of the number of serfs still remaining is high, about a million, while Professor Marion gives the much smaller figure of 140,000. Both agree that it was *mainmorte réelle*, rather than personal servitude, which lingered in the eighteenth century. Professor Sée feels sure that there was a reaction toward greater insistence upon seigniorial rights and dues, of which Professor Aulard not

long ago expressed some doubt, backed by considerable evidence. He also thinks that while the middle class in the cahiers complained chiefly of the tax exemptions of the privileged orders, the peasants made the seigniorial régime their principal grievance. This may be true of the Breton peasants, and as editor of the cahiers of the seneschalship of Rennes Professor Sée would be especially conscious of their attitude, but the reader of the parish cahiers of other districts is often struck by the relatively small amount of space given to feudal burdens and by the moderation of many of the petitions that are included.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Histoire de l'Idée Laïque en France au XIX^e Siècle. Par Georges Weill, Professeur à l'Université de Caen. (Paris, Alcan, 1925, pp. 376, 25 fr.) The title of this book does not indicate with exactness the subject with which it actually deals. The author is aware of this, and says in his preface: "L'idée laïque renferme une conception philosophique sur l'indépendance et la capacité de la raison humaine, et une conception politique sur les droits de l'État et des citoyens vis à vis des Églises. Quoi qu'il soit impossible de les séparer, c'est la seconde conception surtout que j'ai cherché à mettre en lumière." It would have been more accurate to entitle this volume "History of the Anti-Clerical Movement in France in the Nineteenth Century". This title would have had the advantage of obliging the author to define the two terms clericalism and anti-clericalism, which he does not seem to have done with sufficient care or insight. Neither does he seem to us to have endeavored to give a precise analysis of the psychology either of the masses or of the leading men of France during the nineteenth century. In order to do so clearly he should have shown a much closer connection than he has between the origin of this movement and the French Revolution. He does not even mention the *Décade Philosophique*, the greatest anti-clerical journal of the nineteenth century.

He has made use only of printed sources without having recourse to manuscripts. His documentation is interesting but it is very slight in comparison with the amount of material which he might have used, and his reasons for the choice of particular men or works for especial study are not at all clear. Indeed therein lies one of the two principal difficulties in dealing with so delicate a subject: in so large a field, how to choose. The other difficulty is still more serious: how to achieve impartiality in studying a question which, at the present time, is a burning one in France. One feels that M. Weill has made a great effort to be exact, just, and independent, but it can not be said that he has entirely succeeded. He has tacitly and with great moderation accepted the point of view of one of the two parties. Could he have done otherwise? However that may be, when working in a field where the relations which one traces between phenomena completely change their meaning and significance the rôle of the historian is most delicate. It is human nature that should be blamed rather than M. Weill.

This work is interesting and will be of service if it is read with care and a certain caution and by those who are already familiar with the political and intellectual history of Europe in the nineteenth century.

Ireland. By Stephen Gwynn. [The Modern World, edited by the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.P.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, pp. 252, 12 s. 6 d.) The purpose of the series to which Mr. Gwynn's *Ireland* belongs is to provide, in the words of the general editor, Mr. Fisher, "a balanced survey, with such historical illustrations as may be found necessary, of the tendencies and forces, political, economic, intellectual, which are moulding the lives of contemporary states". The volume is thus not so much a history of Ireland as a description of its present condition. Much of the space is taken up with an account, sometimes statistical in its exactness, of the Irish population, its racial and linguistic divisions, its arts and industries, educational and religious institutions. But in Ireland, perhaps to an exceptional degree, the past lives in the present. The relations of men or social groups are constantly determined, not by their actual interests, but by traditional fears and prejudices. Modern parties are still consciously fighting over the battles of the age of Strongbow or of Cromwell, and their conduct and opinions can only be understood in the light of Irish history. So Mr. Gwynn has properly included in his survey a description of the ancient Gaelic culture, and has traced the course of Irish civilization from the time of the Norman invasion, through the long period of English supremacy, down to the recent revolution which has restored land and power, in large part, to the older population. Such a discussion, on the limited scale necessary, was bound to be incomplete, and the analysis of Irish history is doubtless here and there over simplified. Certain subjects, like the old Irish language and literature, are treated hastily and rather carelessly. But in general Mr. Gwynn has seized upon the matters essential to his purpose. And he has achieved the one thing perhaps most to be desired in a work of the sort. He has kept himself free from the partizan prejudices which divide his countrymen. Belonging by birth and social ties to the Protestant gentry, yet of a family which lived in friendly relations with the Gaels of the countryside; himself a Nationalist in politics and liberal-minded in religion—an intellectual in the best sense of the word—he has succeeded in the almost impossible task of writing about Ireland with impartiality.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Modern Turkey: a Politico-economic Interpretation, 1908-1923 inclusive, with selected Chapters by Representative Authorities. By Eliot Grinnell Mears, M.B.A., F.R.Econ.S. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. xvi, 779, \$6.00.) As economic member of the Harbord Mission to Armenia and later as trade commissioner at Constantinople, Mr. Mears had excellent opportunities for gathering information in re-

gard to actual conditions in the new Turkey which dates from the Revolution of 1908. In his book concerning the country as he saw it, with his own eyes and through the eyes of the eighteen contributors to the volume, he undertakes "to set forth the contemporary problems in as simple a fashion as possible" and "to give that kind of a perspective on the conflicting factors underlying the politico-economic life of Turkey which may serve to reveal both their relative values and their interrelation".

The chapters of *Modern Turkey*, while containing more or less historical material, are in the main descriptive or expository. Of Mr. Mears's own chapters, which comprise somewhat more than a third of the text, the most interesting and valuable from the point of view of the historian are the three entitled, respectively, "The Armenian Question", "The Arab Question", and "The Kemalist Movement". Among the contributed chapters, all of which, with one exception, were written in 1920 and are therefore provided by Mr. Mears with introductions designed to record subsequent developments as well as "to promote inter-chapter unity", special mention may be made of those by Dr. Cumberland, Consul General Ravndal, Dr. Putney, Ahmed Emin Bey, and Saleh Kerameth Bey, relating, respectively, to the Public Treasury, the Capitulations, International Relations, the Turkish Press, and the Young Turk Movement.

Following the text of the book are a convenient and fairly comprehensive Chronology of Events affecting Turkey from 1908 to 1923 and a judicious selection of documents (official declarations, reports, treaties, etc.) which, with the comments in the text, go far toward explaining the international complications involving Turkey between 1914 and 1923. The bibliography, comprising twenty-one pages, is unusually complete.

In bringing together a large amount of information concerning actual conditions and in sketching the background of those conditions Mr. Mears has performed a distinct service to students of recent developments in Turkey. He has maintained to a remarkable degree the "fairness of spirit and honesty of intellect" which he believes to be indispensable for the understanding of those developments. His book should prove extremely useful for reference. It is unfortunately, perhaps inevitably, lacking in the unity and the distinction of style, to say nothing of the compression, without which it cannot be expected to gain or hold the attention of a wide circle of readers.

EDGAR TURLINGTON.

Les Origines Immédiates de la Guerre (28 Juin-4 Août 1914). Par Pierre Renouvin, Conservateur à la Bibliothèque-Musée de la Guerre. [Publications de la Société de l'Histoire de la Guerre, troisième série.] (Paris, Alfred Costes, 1925, pp. xvi, 277, 15 fr.) M. Renouvin is a cautious objective scholar. He has sifted carefully all the evidence on the diplomatic crisis which followed the assassination of the Archduke at Sarajevo. He has written by far the best account of the immediate

causes of the war which has appeared from the hand of a Frenchman. He establishes, day by day and hour by hour, the exact sequence of actions, together with the motives and consequences of these actions. This is the kind of book which makes a real advance toward the truth. He sweeps away most of the legends which have fed upon prejudice, propaganda, and ignorance, and which led the Versailles Peace Commission presided over by Mr. Lansing to make the untrue charge that Germany and her allies deliberately plotted the war. But even after clearing away the falsifications and legends which have too long passed current in the Entente countries, M. Renouvin still has serious charges against the Central Powers which throw on them a large share of the responsibility. One of these, however, we do not think is sound: it is to the effect that Bethmann-Hollweg gave way to the pressure of the Prussian militarists on the night of July 30 *before* Russian general mobilization.

On certain other points we could have wished that M. Renouvin had expressed himself more at length. One of these is the question of Serbia's provocation to Austria and the problem of M. Pashitch's responsibility. Another point is the somewhat obscure rôle of France during the July days in her relations to Russia, and the precise influence exercised by President Poincaré and by Paléologue and Izvolski.

Historical students will endorse M. Renouvin's conclusion that in last analysis there may be said to be three general causes for the outbreak of the War: suspicion and fear on the part of officials; the system of alliances and the fear of weakening them, which made Germany afraid to restrain Austria, just as France was afraid to restrain Russia; and the influence in a crisis which is exercised by the pressure of technical military considerations. These causes were at work more or less in all countries in Europe.

S. B. F.

The Commission for Relief in Belgium: Statistical Review of Relief Operations. By George I. Gay. (Stanford, Calif., University Press, 1925, pp. ix, 439.) The work of the Commission for Relief in Belgium was not only work of a high quality of benevolence and public spirit, but in respect to quantity was a business operation of enormous proportions, involving in the total a sum nearly approaching a billion dollars. By reason of this, and of its grave responsibilities to belligerents, the commission from the beginning kept careful and detailed records, and for the same reasons it is a real service to history to publish the story of the work. Of that story the present volume is a part. It contains some 80 pages of text, and a multitude of statistical tables. It sticks close to its purpose as a statistical review, but the historical reader who has either imagination or memory will have no difficulty in investing with color and romance and poignant interest this exhibition of magnificent energy, organizing power, and beneficence, whereby operations greater than the peace-time doings of many a national government were carried on at a cost of .43 of one per

cent. of the money and values handled. Of the total funds secured and expended 78 per cent. came from government subsidies, 6 per cent. from the world's charity, 15 per cent. from operation surplus and profits. Of the \$700,000,000 of government subsidies, 55 per cent. came from the treasury of the United States, 29 per cent. from that of France, 16 per cent. from that of Great Britain. Of the \$52,000,000 which came from the world's charity, two-thirds, or \$34,500,000, came from the United States and nearly one-third from the British Empire, more than half of the latter coming from Australia and New Zealand (8.7 million from them, 5.7 from the United Kingdom, 1.7 from Canada).

The volume has a brief preface by Mr. Herbert Hoover, whose work as chairman of the commission deserves more of the world's gratitude than the achievements of any conqueror.

Christian Missions and Oriental Civilization: a Study in Culture Contact. The Reactions of Non-Christian Peoples to Protestant Missions from the Standpoint of Individual and Group Behavior: Outline, Materials, Problems, and Tentative Interpretations. By Maurice T. Price, Ph.D., with a Foreword by Dr. Robert E. Park, Professorial Lecturer in the University of Chicago. (Shanghai, China: privately printed, 1924, pp. xxvi, 578. Obtainable from the G. E. Stechert Company or from the Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, \$3.75.) Historians have as a rule been singularly blind to the importance of Christian missions in the modern period. We have many volumes on the "expansion of Europe", but that series of movements with its far-reaching consequences has almost always been treated as an activity of governments and business, of foreign and colonial offices, and of traders, shipping interests, and bankers. Christian missions have either been ignored or have been dismissed with scant and frequently contemptuous mention. A careful and well-rounded survey of the impact of European upon non-European peoples would, however, long ago have disclosed to all unbiassed observers, no matter what their attitude toward the Christian faith, that the activities of Christian missionaries have been and are one of the more outstanding phases of the spread of European peoples and cultures. There is not lacking an extensive literature on the subject, but it has been prepared almost exclusively by friends and advocates of missions and not by the trained historian.

The present volume is not by an historian, but it is of importance as a professed attempt at an impartial study of one phase of the missionary enterprise, "the reactions of non-Christian peoples to Protestant missions" (the subtitle being a more nearly accurate description of the book than is the title). Dr. Price's interests are those of a sociologist and psychologist, and he devotes his pages primarily to the motives and processes of the rejection and acceptance of the missionary's message. His book contains a wealth of illustration and quotation from interesting and important source-material, interspersed with comments and summaries of

his own. While deriving most of his material from missionary sources and attempting to be unbiassed, Dr. Price tends to be distinctly critical of the missionary and usually speaks of him as a "propagandist", as though questioning his disinterested sincerity. He fails, indeed, to understand him, to enter accurately into his mind and motives. Since the work is frankly a social and psychological study, the terminology employed in the author's comments is technical, often highly so. The volume is a distinctly important contribution to the scientific study of missions. Since it deals with only a few phases of the enterprise, however, it is to be hoped that it will be followed by the others that are half promised in Dr. Park's introduction.

K. S. LATOURETTE.

The Abridged Compendium of American Genealogy: First Families of America. Edited by Frederick A. Virkus. (Chicago, A. N. Marquis and Company, 1925, pp. 1148, \$22.00.) The first 964 pages of this stout volume contain compressed statements of the genealogies of some 7000 persons, assumed to represent the first families of the United States, though the principle of selection is nowhere stated. So many living persons of a certain importance are however included, and so many figures of the past are mentioned in the genealogies, that the book may often be of use to historical students. The method of arrangement is clear, the index full and excellent. The brief biographies or identifications of about a thousand immigrant ancestors, listed in alphabetical order on pages 965-997, to relieve preceding pages of duplication, will perhaps be found especially useful to the historical student. A second volume of equal extent, illustrated with photographs of ancestors and coats of arms, is also promised.

The Discovery of North America Twenty Years before Columbus. By Sofus Larsen, Ph.D. (Copenhagen, Levin and Munksgaard; London, Hachette Ltd., 1925, pp. 116.) The theme, which the author of this pamphlet primarily has under consideration, relates to the Portuguese participation in the expedition or expeditions sent out by King Christiern I. of Denmark to Arctic waters to discover new islands and continents, and this about twenty years before Columbus's first voyage.

Very briefly, as an introduction to his discussion, the author touches upon the distinguished services of Prince Henry the Navigator, but he appears still to hold to the erroneous conception that it was a part of his purpose to find a sea route to the Indies of the East. He then proceeds to trace the history of the relations, which seem to have begun about the year 1448, between the King of Portugal and the King of Denmark, and which for some years thereafter he finds to have been intimate. The theory is supported that it was Portugal which particularly favored closer relationship between the two countries, since for Denmark there was no prospect of gain either in Portugal or in Africa, while Portugal sought

aid for the exploration of the Arctic waters, to find, perchance by way of the north, what there had been failure to find by way of the south—a water route to the distant land of Asia.

A considerable part of the author's paper is devoted more especially to a consideration of the voyage of King Christiern, made "at the request of the Portuguese King", says an early document, about the year 1472, in which expedition probably João Vaz Corte-Real, father of Gaspar Corte-Real, took a prominent part, with Labrador as the western limit.

The early cartography of Greenland and neighboring regions is somewhat critically treated, the author finding therein support for the belief in the João Vaz voyage, and he critically cites the Claudius Clavus, the Olaus Magnus, the Cantino, the Munich-Portuguese map records, making the very usual erroneous allusion to the last two as reproduced in full by HARRISSE and by KUNSTMANN, whereas their reproductions include but half of the originals. Only by the undersigned reviewer have these been reproduced in full size. The paper is an interpretation, interesting but often far from convincing.

E. L. STEVENSON.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Volume LVIII. (Boston, the Society, 1925, pp. xvi, 477.) The reviewer of such a volume must let it be taken for granted that it contains a multitude of interesting single documents or short pieces of historical comment, and can refer by title to the most important contributions only. Of these Mr. G. G. WOLKINS's paper and documents on Daniel Malcom and Writs of Assistance, and those of Colonel Charles E. Banks on Thomas Morton of Merry Mount must be specifically mentioned; also Mr. Allan FORBES's entertaining paper on Marches and Camp Sites of the French Army in New England during the Revolutionary War, and Mr. Charles G. WASHBURN's valuable, though partizan, memoir of Henry Cabot Lodge. Mr. WOLKINS also contributes, from the Treasury Papers in the London Public Record Office, an official report (1768) by Joseph HARRISON and Benjamin HALLOWELL, collector and comptroller, respectively, of the port of Boston, giving practically a history of the Boston custom-house administration since 1707 and an account of the trade of the colony. The officials of other historical societies may well take note of Mr. FORD's instructive statement on Ten Years of the Photostat, with its appended list of individual rarities reproduced by that method. Especial attention should be called to the beautiful reproduction in this volume of Robert TYNDALL's Draught of Virginia, 1608, now in the British Museum, the first map of Virginia and the second map made in a British plantation on the North American continent.

Geographia Americae, with an Account of the Delaware Indians. Based on Surveys and Notes made in 1654-1656 by Peter LINDESTRÖM. Translated from the Original Manuscript with Notes, Introduction, and

an Appendix of Indian Geographical Names with their Meanings, by Amandus Johnson. (Philadelphia, Swedish Colonial Society, 1925, pp. xlv, 418, \$8.00.) This stout volume by Dr. Johnson adds another title to the growing list of his works upon New Sweden. His first one, *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware*, was enough to establish a claim for him as the foremost authority in this field. Seven years ago the present work was ready for the press. Then the editor joined the heroic company of Carlyle and other late sufferers by having his manuscript destroyed in a fire.

Lindeström was born in 1632 and he died in 1691. The *Geographia* was written in his last days from surveys and notes made by him in the years 1654-1656, when he was adventuring in New Sweden, on the Delaware. The original manuscript, of 249 quarto pages, is in the Royal Archives in Stockholm. There is a copy of it in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Lindeström divided his work into twenty-nine chapters. Dr. Johnson's translation of it covers 280 pages. About half of it is given to Dedication, Preface, and the voyage to New Sweden. The rest is about evenly divided between a description of New Sweden proper and data concerning the American Indians.

Some of Lindeström's stories are fantastic—the vain imaginings of perfervid youth. Such are his tales of the human flesh pies sold at Calais; the mermaids that sat on the water, "very charming and bright", so that some on the ship leaped into the sea and were lost; also the flying-fish that could go a lap of ten miles straight. Yet, as the editor explains, Lindeström is not unique in his phantasies for this early period.

The data on the life and institutions of New Sweden, and on Indian customs, are the real contribution of the *Geographia*. Lindeström's maps of New Sweden, reproduced by Dr. Johnson in this volume, are also of especial value. While these maps have their minor lapses, yet they contain a large amount of valuable detail—the work of one who had made some previous study of cartography.

The biographical sketch of Lindeström, the copious footnotes, and the Appendix of Indian Geographical Names, with their meanings, by the indefatigable editor, are the sifted results of a vast amount of patient, skillful research.

Peter Mårtensson Lindeström receives now his tardy justice. He takes his place with Johan Rising and Johan Campanius as one of the great contemporary historians of New Sweden.

Pennsylvania History told by Contemporaries. By Asa Earl Martin, Professor of American History in the Pennsylvania State College, and Hiram Herr Shenk, Archivist in the State Library at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. xxi, 621, \$2.40.) This volume has been compiled to meet "a widespread demand for the requirement of state history as a part of the present curriculum either in

the grades or in the high schools". With the prevalent tendency toward curtailing the course in United States history in our schools, or sharing its field with allied subjects, the legal requirement of some study of state history presents its difficulties. Separate courses are not always possible, nor altogether desirable, since repetition and duplication can scarcely be avoided if the story of the state's beginnings and development is given its proper background. A combination of national and state history in a single volume, after the manner of the "state editions" of civics, would be apt to lack balance through emphasizing or overemphasizing the one phase or the other.

This volume offers a solution to the problem as it affects Pennsylvania, by co-ordinating the history of the state with that of the nation. Selected sources which may be read in connection with the study of the corresponding national topics are grouped under the following heads: the Founding of Pennsylvania, Native Pennsylvanians (Indians), Resistance to Great Britain, Establishment of the Federal Government, the Antislavery Movement, Civil War, Foreign Wars, Political Development, Social Life, Education, Economic Development, Labor Conditions, Transportation and Internal Improvements, Finance and Banking, and Economic and Political Tendencies. A brief, sometimes too brief, introduction precedes each selection, and the source is indicated at the end. The volume should prove useful to the teacher and helpful to all students of Pennsylvania history, in the classroom or out. One might wish that, for the comments of a Philadelphia newspaper on the effect of the attack on Fort Sumter and on the coercion of the Southern States (pp. 220-221), which have no direct bearing on Pennsylvania history as such, there would have been substituted, in its proper place, something illustrating the literary side of the state's history.

L. F. S.

The Virginia Frontier, 1754-1763. By Louis K. Koontz, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XLIII., no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1925, pp. 186, \$1.50.) This is a doctoral dissertation of rather more than usual value, which is increased by a good index. The author does not attempt to deal in detail with events that have been fully treated elsewhere. He dismisses, for instance, Fort Necessity and Braddock's campaign with little more than a reference. He has aimed, rather, to fill in the lacunae.

Probably his most valuable chapter is the chapter headed "The Forts on the Frontier", in which he gives a short account, with full references to the sources of information, of each one of the forts, including block-houses and stockades, first and last erected on the Virginia frontier. There are no fewer than 81 entries. The list contains Fort Pitt (old Fort Duquesne)—rightfully, because in that day most people thought that Fort Pitt was in Virginia territory. It also includes Fort Loudoun on the Holston thirty miles southwest of where Knoxville, Tenn., now

stands. That region, too, was then supposed to be in Virginia. Fort Cumberland, known to be in Maryland, but more frequently than otherwise garrisoned by Virginia troops, is also in the list. This chapter will be a boon to librarians in Virginia and West Virginia, who have for years been bombarded with questions they could not answer as to the exact location of one or another of these forts.

Dr. Koontz's treatment of Governor Dinwiddie's relations with the general assembly of Virginia (though he insists on calling the House of Burgesses the "Assembly") and with George Washington is also very satisfactory. He places the elderly Dinwiddie (65 years of age when he left Virginia, and in bad health, having suffered two strokes of paralysis) securely in the position of an administrator of the first rank—far-seeing and indomitable—worthy forerunner of the Milners and Cromers of our time. But for Dinwiddie's impolitic "salary grab" in the shape of an imposition of a fee for passing a patent under his seal, which, technically, he had the right to make, but the unwisdom of which he quickly deplored, he would long since have been recognized by Virginians as one to whom they owed a debt of gratitude for the statesmanlike way in which he administered their affairs in a critical period.

Makers of Naval Tradition. By Carroll Storrs Alden, Ph.D., and Ralph Earle, D.Sc. (Boston and New York, Ginn and Company, 1925, pp. xii, 332, \$1.50.) This book was written by Professor Alden and Captain Earle, who for many years have been interested in naval education, with a view to the needs of the midshipmen of the U. S. Naval Academy for a brief account of the traditions of the American navy and of the careers of the distinguished officers who established those traditions. They had also in mind the needs of civilians who wish to inform themselves on these subjects. Popular and readable, their volume is well adapted to instruct both classes of readers.

As the chief makers of naval tradition, twelve naval leaders were chosen for special treatment, and to each of them a chapter is devoted. In this selection consideration was given to the various kinds of tradition and the several periods of naval history. The American Revolution is represented by Jones; the War of 1812, by Decatur and Macdonough; the Civil War, by Farragut and Porter; the Spanish-American War, by Dewey; naval diplomacy, by M. C. Perry; meteorology and oceanography, by Maury; naval ordnance, by Dahlgren; naval education, by Luce; naval history, by Mahan; and naval science and organization, by Sampson. This summary errs somewhat on the side of simplicity, for some of these officers had diverse achievements and saw service during more than one period. The achievements of a few of the minor leaders are also described, as are those of the officers who made traditions during and after the World War.

Dealing for the most part with concrete events, the authors seldom indulge in pleasing generalities, of which the following may be taken as

an illustration: "If the navy is an institution worth while, it represents American character, and it is most truly national when it represents the best" (p. 6). Occasionally one meets with an overstatement, as in the following: "Rarely has an officer been so thoroughly identified with a victory as was Sampson with Santiago" (p. 289). The book is excellently printed and illustrated.

CHARLES O. PAULLIN.

The History of the United States Post Office to the Year 1829. By Wesley Everett Rich, Ph.D. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. XXVII.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924, pp. vii, 190, \$2.00.) The circumstances attending the publication of this book assure it a friendly reception. The introduction by Professor Charles J. Bullock relates briefly the story of the work of Dr. Rich to the time of his death at Camp Devens in 1918, and informs the reader that this study is but the beginning of a comprehensive investigation which the author intended to make of the history and present operations of the United States Post Office. The hope is expressed that the publication of this part of the undertaking may serve as a worthy memorial of a promising young economist and at the same time stimulate and assist some other investigator in carrying on the work to completion.

There is little to criticize and much to commend in the work that Dr. Rich has done. His information is usually exact, his bibliographical knowledge is good, and his presentation is clear and, in so far as the subject-matter permits, attractive. The first three chapters, on the history of the Colonial Post, are minute and careful studies and they appear to be as nearly complete and final as they can be made. Chapter IV., on the Early Days of the American Post Office, 1775-1789, brings the story to the opening of the constitutional period.

Two of the most significant chapters in the book, for the student of American history, are chapter V., on the Extension of Postal Service, 1789-1829, and chapter VI., on the Post Office as a Public Service, 1790-1829. It happens that these chapters leave the most to be desired as to method. The extension of the postal service can hardly be described without the use of maps, and the book, perhaps because of the circumstances of its appearance, does not contain a single map. The failure to make a proper use of maps causes the author to fall into minor inaccuracies and leaves the reader bewildered by unassimilable details. Both chapters are deficient in needed information that can be found in early newspapers and in no other place. The official records of the department are far too lean to be relied upon for the story of the extension of the posts and the public service that they have rendered.

The author deals adequately with the remaining four topics. They represent, with one exception, the more distinctly economic aspects of the history of the Post Office, such as the Internal Organization of the Post Office Department, Politics in the Post Office Department, Financial Operations of the Post Office, and Postal Policies, 1639-1829.

It is probably safe to say that the future historian of the Post Office can begin his work where this study leaves off, and if this is true the publication of the results of the investigation by Dr. Rich is abundantly justified.

J. P. BRETZ.

Sovereign States and Suits before Arbitral Tribunals and Courts of Justice. By James Brown Scott. (New York, New York University Press, 1925, pp. x, 360, \$6.00.) On all subjects affecting the peaceful relations of nations, Dr. Scott speaks as an expert, and no man is better entitled to be termed a "citizen of the world". In this series of papers delivered in the James Stokes Lectureship on Politics, he has given a thorough summary of present methods of settlement of international disputes—offer of good offices, mediation, commissions of inquiry, arbitration, and judicial decision. Of all the author's comments as to the relative values of these different methods, the most striking is undoubtedly his reference to the twenty-one peace treaties negotiated by William J. Bryan as Secretary of State in 1913-1914, as follows (p. 101): "It is well-nigh impossible to over-estimate the value of these treaties and the principles they incorporate. They are, if I may say so, the greatest advance towards peaceful settlement made by any one man, at any one time, and in any one instrument."

In his first lecture, Dr. Scott develops the nature of sovereignty in a state. His second lecture sets forth the peculiar relation of the independent, sovereign American states to the Union, and its bearing upon the Society of Nations. Two lectures describe in detail the relinquishment by each state of the sovereign right of immunity from suit by another state, the successful functioning of the United States Supreme Court in controversies between sovereign states, and its bearing upon the possibility of an equally successful World Court. A final lecture gives an account of the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration, the Court of Arbitral Justice, and the Permanent Court of International Justice. Credit is rightly given to Elihu Root for his successful efforts in framing the statute for the latter (the World Court); but the author's modesty prevents him from stating the part which his own work has played in that connection. But what explanation can be given of the remarkable fact that in a book of over three hundred pages, devoted to methods for the preservation of international peace, the name of Woodrow Wilson is never once mentioned, either in text, foot-notes, or index (though space is found for William McKinley, John Hay, Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, and Charles E. Hughes)?

CHARLES WARREN.

The Papers of John Steele. Edited by H. M. Wagstaff, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of North Carolina. In two volumes. [Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission.] (Raleigh,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—24.

1924, pp. xxviii, 464; 467-929.) There is a rather large group of statesmen of the formative period in United States history whose national importance does not warrant their names finding a place in the ordinary history manuals. To this group John Steele of North Carolina belongs. At the very beginning of his political career, he was a member of the Hillsborough Convention which rejected the Federal Constitution. His part in that convention helps to explain why, despite his superior ability, he was surpassed in political preferment in his state by men of lesser calibre. Steele was an ardent champion of the Constitution and remained a consistent Federalist to the end of his days, while North Carolina, despite its eventual ratification of the Constitution, remained as consistently anti-Federalist and Republican. With the exception of two terms in the lower house of the United States Congress—the first and second—he was never elected to any high federal or state office. In 1796 he was appointed by President Washington comptroller of the United States Treasury. He held this position for six years, after which his most conspicuous services were rendered to his state in helping to fix the boundary with South Carolina and Georgia. He died in 1815, when he was only fifty years old.

While John Steele did not become nationally prominent himself, he was in more or less intimate relations with a number of men who did. Among the letters in these volumes are some to and from Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Oliver Wolcott, Nathaniel Macon, Albert Gallatin, and many others of lesser importance. Naturally the subject-matter is varied, and while much of it is of only personal and ephemeral interest, such topics as state and national finance, Indian relations, foreign relations, and the like are touched upon and in some cases rather fully discussed. Even in the letters of a personal nature, many interesting sidelights are thrown on the social, economic, and political conditions of the time. In addition to the letters over two hundred and fifty pages are devoted to miscellaneous documents. These include advertisements, deeds, legal notes, Cherokee treaties, the boundary settlement with South Carolina, and a variety of others.

The manuscript material from which these two volumes are compiled is made up of two collections belonging to the North Carolina Historical Society and the North Carolina Historical Commission. Professor Wagstaff is to be congratulated upon the thoroughness with which he has discharged the task of editing, and the North Carolina Historical Commission upon excellence of printing and general appearance of the volumes.

B. B. KENDRICK.

Expansionists of 1812. By Julius W. Pratt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Rutgers University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. 309, \$2.00.) The six chapters of this study fall into three divisions whose importance and freshness of treatment vary in direct proportion to the use which the author has made of the results of

his delving into the manuscript sources of the period in Washington, Chicago, Boston, New York, and Columbus, Ohio. So far as East Florida is concerned, he makes a distinct contribution to the knowledge of a none-too-creditable phase of expansion.

The main thesis is not new and a considerable portion of the book is merely a re-presentation of well-known views of statesmen and newspapers, with frequent references to the *Annals of Congress* and the *American State Papers*. The thesis, briefly stated, is as follows: Enthusiasm for war and annexation of territory was at its height at the periphery of a crescent having one end in New Hampshire and the other in Savannah, Georgia. It was a crescent which traversed frontier territory, bordered foreign soil, British and Spanish, and confronted dangerous Indian tribes among whom foreign influence was suspected and feared, a crescent thinly peopled by men nationally patriotic to the point of chauvinism, bitterly resentful of their country's wrongs, scornful of the earlier futile measures to repel them, and increasingly convinced of the imperial destiny of the United States to expand from Key West and Vera Cruz on the south to the "regions of eternal frost" on the north (pp. 126, 130).

Over against this enthusiasm faction flourished most luxuriantly near the centre of the republic, and a timid, fumbling, vacillating, faction-ridden government, run by uncertain alternating currents of desire and half-immoral opportunism, ultimately defeated the expansionists.

By far the best part of the volume is the two and a half chapters dealing with the "lure of the Spanish provinces", and the discreditable assaults upon the provincial Spanish authorities in the Floridas and in Texas. From new manuscript sources the author admirably sets forth in interesting detail the wretched sordidness of the attempt of the Georgians and Tennesseans to wrest the Floridas from Spain, and the year-long connivance of the federal government in the invasions of Spanish territory under George Mathews as moving spirit, and the final repudiation of Mathews and all his works by Monroe as Secretary of State (pp. 112-113).

The sections dealing with Canada are little more than restatements of well-known facts and arguments drawn from the *Annals of Congress* and equally common sources. Probably their insertion here finds justification in the need to round out the picture and give perspective under the title chosen for the volume. The chapter on Sectional Politics (III.) represents a useful application of the Turnerian method of studying the influences at work in the political parties of the time, as shown by the votes in Congress and in the committees of that body. The triumph of factionalism and the consequent gradual numbing of the enthusiasm for vast expansions North and South are well set forth in the final chapter.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier. By Ralph Leslie Rusk, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English in Columbia University. In two volumes. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1925, pp. xiii, 457; vi, 419, \$7.50.) This is a laborious, learned, and useful contribution to the history of the West. It represents a relatively clean sweep of the material on the literary aspect of Western culture, classifying with intelligence and appraising with fairness. It goes, in a sense, to prove a negative; as Professor John R. Commons's *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* did in another field. The latter work, after a comprehensive examination of all the sources, established the generalization that before the Civil War the American labor movement was only rudimentary and symptomatic, never vital. This work of Professor Rusk establishes with equal conclusiveness the fact that the literary flights of the frontier were few, and rarely reached great heights. The more discriminating students of the frontier have long known this, but none of them has hitherto made its demonstration on a grand and final scale.

The technique of the author is simple and satisfying. There are nine critical or descriptive chapters, dealing with travel, education, controversy, scholarship, fiction, poetry, and periodicals. These are preceded by an illuminating chapter on cultural beginnings. Most of the second volume is devoted to a bibliography that constitutes a needed checklist of Middle-Western literature, erring, if at all, on the safe side of over-inclusiveness.

We need more books like this, dealing with the bed-rock of Western fact. Western history has gone as far along the path of generalization as is profitable until fields have been identified and checked. It has been possible for a recent critic of the frontier theory so completely to misunderstand it as to think it means a claim for the West as the originator of all the useful elements in American culture. Some of the writers on the West, in their more romantic moments, have indeed provided an excuse for this misunderstanding. But properly speaking the frontier theory deals with the West as a source of superabundant energy, rather than of qualitative advance. The real frontier has been as capable of nurturing the vicious as the benevolent. Its influence has been grounded in a certain elemental vigor which, as Professor Rusk reveals, has not been associated with an unusual degree of literary creation, or even appreciation.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

The Expansionist Movement in Texas, 1836-1850. By William Campbell Binkley, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in Colorado College. [University of California Publications in History, vol. XIII.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1925, pp. x, 253, \$3.50.) This subject has been treated partially and incidentally from various angles. It remained, however, to isolate it and study it directly and consecutively. This is a species of laboratory service that History sometimes exacts of

her votaries. It is often self-sacrificing labor, involving the threshing of much old straw with the promise of yielding very small store of hard, fresh grain. Mr. Binkley has performed his task in a workmanlike manner. He has sifted all available sources, and has written a vigorous, straightforward report of his investigation. The first chapter is an excellent summary of the troubled history of the Spanish-Mexican boundary of Texas. The next four chapters follow the aspirations and efforts of Texan leaders toward the establishment of a far western boundary—in the hope partly, if not mainly, of making their country more desirable to expansionists in the United States. Chapter VI. deals with the boundary in the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War, and the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Chapters VII. and VIII. discuss the conflict of jurisdiction between Texas and the United States in New Mexico up to the final settlement in the Compromise of 1850. For students of Texas history, the most noteworthy contribution is the account of the marauding expeditions authorized by President Houston and led by Charles A. Warfield and Jacob Snively against the Mexican Santa Fe trade. By comparison, the better known and more formal expedition authorized by President Lamar appears in a more favorable light than students have usually been willing to view it in. The book is well equipped with black and white maps, and the bibliography and index are exhaustive.

EUGENE C. BARKER.

Lincoln the Litigant. By William H. Townsend, with an Introduction by William E. Barton. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. ix, 117, \$5.00.) In this little volume one finds, not a treatment of Lincoln the lawyer—a theme which has been dealt with elsewhere—but an account of cases at law in which Lincoln was a party. Gleaning his material from court records and the papers of the Lincoln-Herndon firm, Mr. Townsend shows how Lincoln's own affairs were, from time to time, brought into court. There were cases in which Lincoln sued for the recovery of counsel's fees (the case against the Illinois Central Railroad being the best known); there were actions by impatient creditors of the Berry-Lincoln store; there was litigation touching the estate of Lincoln's father-in-law, Robert S. Todd, and there was a petty criminal action against the boy Lincoln who, because he rowed passengers out to meet the Ohio River steamers, was prosecuted (unsuccessfully) for infringement of rights under a ferry franchise. Glimpses of Lincoln in his New Salem and Springfield days impart a human interest to the book. A wordy controversy with one James Adams, whom Lincoln accused of forgery, is set forth at undue length. The book is handsomely published in a limited edition, with nine illustrations, and will make its chief appeal to collectors of Lincolniana. It is very short and for the more serious student of history it offers little that is new. Author's preface and index are lacking.

J. G. RANDALL.

Released for Publication: Some Inside Political History of Theodore Roosevelt and his Times, 1898-1918. By Oscar King Davis. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. viii, 468, \$5.00.) This is a work of reminiscence as well as observation, by a veteran journalist who began by treating Theodore Roosevelt as copy, and ended as so many others did by accepting him as a guide of life. Covering the White House for the *Times*, Mr. Davis served an employer whose editorial aim was to shoot holes through the plans and policies of Roosevelt. He left the *Times* in 1912 to become secretary of the Progressive National Committee and a working member of the Colonel's team. What he has written before this date comes within the class of first-rate correspondence; afterwards he was one of the principals of the Progressive clan, of whom he writes a little ruefully, "Sheep respond to leadership, but goats do not".

Mr. Davis disclaims chronological accuracy, and occasionally shows the weakness of memory as a source. He tells, with much detail, how Roosevelt lay in wait for Governor Hughes, in 1908, with a special message to Congress on employers' liability; and how, on the eve of Hughes's utterance of his specific candidacy, the message was released too late for the afternoon papers, so that it would "blanket" Hughes the morning after. He says the Hughes meeting occurred January 30, 1908; but it and its speech really came the following day. His specific assertion as to late release by Roosevelt is challenged by the fact that evening papers in New York and Wisconsin printed the message the afternoon before the delivery of the Hughes speech; and the effectiveness of the "blanketing" may be questioned if one has examined the morning papers of February 1, 1908, and has seen how widely the Hughes announcement was allowed to compete for space with the final details of the trial of Harry Thaw.

On the other hand, the author rescues Roosevelt from the charge, so often made, that the platform of the 1908 Republican Convention was given out at the White House before the Convention met. It was not. It was surreptitiously obtained through a channel in which Borah of Idaho was a distinguished actor. And its early publication by the *Times* was regarded, even in the sophisticated atmosphere of Mr. Van Anda's managerial office, as a remarkable scoop. There is a real contribution, as well, upon the manners and tactics of Hiram Johnson as companion with Roosevelt, upon the Progressive ticket. Until Senator Johnson himself traverses the charge, the testimony will remain one-sided; but Mr. Davis suggests that he was self-centred and determined, and added much to the embarrassments of a political management that was already at wit's end. It is interesting to note also that, partizan as he is, Mr. Davis believes that it would have been unwise to let the Colonel have his division, or even his brigade, in 1917.

The book ranks well alongside of John J. Leary's *Talks with T. R.*, which was similarly produced. There is probably material for a dozen

more such books, for Colonel Roosevelt trusted his friends, and repaid their devotion with open talk; and nearly every one of the correspondents has some Roosevelt fragment in his note-books, but neither they nor this will add much to the outlines that are already well established for the historian. The time is almost ripe for a real biographer to survey the man.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Calendar of the Kentucky Papers of the Draper Collection of Manuscripts. Prepared by Mabel C. Weeks. [Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Calendar Series, vol. II.] (Madison, the Society, 1925, pp. 624, \$7.50.) What are called the Kentucky Papers in the Draper Collection fill thirty-four volumes, and constitute a large fraction of the manuscripts accumulated by Dr. Lyman C. Draper which related to the history of Kentucky. Another important group of manuscripts relating in large part to that state is the George Rogers Clark Papers. The present calendar, prepared by Miss Weeks while she was chief of the division of maps and manuscripts in the library of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, is a sequel to the calendar of the Preston and Virginia Papers, published by the society in 1915. It is a well-constructed calendar of some 3700 documents, chiefly manuscripts of Kentucky history beginning in 1768 and mostly prior to 1860, but including some 400 undated pieces that present the results of interviews of Rev. John D. Shane (ca. 1840-1860) with various persons cognizant of early Kentucky history. An index of 80 pages of fine print covers with elaborate care the whole volume. Students not only of Kentucky history but of much else in Western history will be grateful to Miss Weeks, to Dr. Quaife, and to Dr. Schafer. The cost of publication, it is pleasant to know, is defrayed by the income of a bequest made to the society by the late Dr. R. G. Thwaites.

Hawaii, 1778-1920, from the Viewpoint of a Bishop, being the Story of English and American Churchmen in Hawaii, with Historical Side-lights. By the Right Reverend Henry Bond Restarick, D.D. (Honolulu, *Paradise of the Pacific Press*, 1924, pp. 413.) This book is a history of the Episcopal Church in Hawaii, written by one who was its ecclesiastical head for nearly twenty years. As such it is a contribution of some importance to church history, to missionary history, and to the general history of Hawaii. It has a special value by reason of the "historical sidelights", which the author tells us were not a part of his original plan. For his data Bishop Restarick has drawn upon materials which have passed through his hands in the course of a busy career and upon the results of rather extensive special research since his retirement from active service. He has brought to the task obvious qualifications due to his official position in the church and to his wide acquaintance and friendly relations with leaders and people both inside and outside of his denomination.

With allowance for some overlapping, the volume may be divided into four parts: (1) chapters 1-4 (27 pages), conditions in Hawaii prior to 1820; (2) chapters 5, 9-12 (50 pages), the work of the pioneer missionaries sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; (3) chapters 6-8, 13-23 (122 pages), the establishment of the Episcopal Church in Hawaii and its history under English auspices; (4) chapters 24-41 (195 pages), the history of the diocese as a part of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. This last part is to some extent autobiographical in character.

In the first part of the book the author has brought together considerable evidence to show that in Hawaii civilization had made greater progress than is generally supposed, prior to the coming of the pioneer American missionaries. Nevertheless, those missionaries, who arrived in 1820, found an immense task confronting them. Bishop Restarick devotes the second part of his book to a discussion of their labors over a period of forty years. He pays tribute to their zeal, their faith, courage, and hard work, and confesses that it is remarkable how much they did accomplish in face of the obstacles they had to contend with. Still, he believes that the gloomy Calvinistic theology of the missionaries and their strict views in regard to amusement, Sabbath observance, and similar matters were ill adapted to the people among whom they labored. This is a familiar line of criticism, but it is presented in this book in a rather more charitable spirit than was customary seventy-five years ago. And the author points out that if the missionaries "were narrow in some matters, as viewed from present-day standards, it was the fault of the age in which they lived, and of the training which they received".

The Episcopal Church (at first called the Hawaiian Reformed Catholic Church) was established in Hawaii in 1862 under the patronage of King Kamehameha IV. The first bishop was an English High Churchman. Many Americans (missionaries and others) looked on this step as part of a deep-laid political scheme to turn the Hawaiian Islands over to England. To Bishop Restarick it seems clear that the establishment of the Episcopal Church did have some political significance—not however in the direction of making Hawaii a British colony, but in the direction of strengthening and perpetuating the Hawaiian monarchy. Kamehameha IV. believed that the Episcopal form of church organization was better suited to a monarchy than the Congregational form. The latter, tied up as it was to American traditions, was too republican in its tendency.

COMMUNICATION

The Editor of the American Historical Review:

Sir: I trust you will admit some comment on the review of *David Wilmot, Freesoiler*, which appeared in your columns last January. It is late to offer it, the delay being due to absence from the country and deeply disturbing experiences later, but it relates to what I take to be misconception of facts.

The conditions forcing a biographer in this case to attempt no more than a political (as distinguished from a personal) portraiture are explained in the introduction; they are the disappearance of all Wilmot's private papers and of almost the entire generation that knew him. The reviewer is good enough to say that "as an account of Wilmot's part in public affairs, the volume is all that could be desired". That is all that it makes any claim to be. But he then proceeds to class it as a "history of the times" and in this aspect to criticize it as unbalanced and biased because of the author's "confining his attention so largely to Free-Soilers and their views" instead of to "the study of Democratic statesmen and their motives". My book, in point of fact, makes no pretension at all to being a history of the times. It is concerned only with certain episodes in one phase of that history—with that section of the Free-Soil movement in which Wilmot was engaged; and even here, to keep within the limits of individual portraiture, it must make of many contemporary events only a summary or synopsis, sufficient merely to furnish the background or setting of the statesman. He was a leading and intensely active member of one political party or faction; inevitably his story must put the affairs of that party in the foreground. With the other party he had nothing to do internally; he met it only when and as its plans and preparations were condensed into policies and action. Inevitably the space it occupies in depicting Wilmot's career is subordinate; but whenever consistent, as in the digest of the debate on the Proviso (chapters XII. and XIII.), full hearing is given to the opposition.

To explain the treatment of historic fact more clearly, take the one instance of (at least implied) deficient research which Professor McCormac cites specifically—the remark on page 32 that "the Democratic National Convention of 1844, it will be remembered, defeated Van Buren by a bit of sharp practice in the adoption of the two-thirds rule", etc. This was not offered, manifestly, as a complete interpretation of that Convention. It is a mere parenthetical observation, made in passing, to define more clearly Wilmot's attitude as a devoted Van Burenite in the ensuing campaign. It is closely analogous to the remark that might be made (say) by a biographer of Talleyrand that "it will be remembered

that Napoleon had been defeated at Waterloo by the Duke of Wellington". A critical study of the complex of forces in the Convention would be as far out of my picture of Wilmot as a digression by Talleyrand's biographer into the strategy of the battle or the credit due to Blücher or the Duke of Brunswick. The facts important to the delineation of Wilmot's public career (the only purpose in view) are that Van Buren was defeated by a manipulation of the two-thirds rule, and that the Annexationists were the dominant force opposing him. Even Justin H. Smith (whose works the reviewer assumes I have not read) admits this. That it was considered "sharp practice" when used against Van Buren, as it had been previously when used in his favor, and that it was "notorious", the political literature of the period abundantly proves. The facts as I state them are repeated by many historians, and they are the only facts necessary to explain Wilmot's conduct at this juncture.

Lastly, it is true, as the reviewer says, that "no use" was made of the works of Justin H. Smith or of "many biographies and monographs which deal with the period"; but the reason is not, as his phraseology implies, that they were not examined, or that the research was narrow or superficial. Scores, perhaps hundreds, of such works were consulted in the alcoves of the Library of Congress. Many of them are not quoted because, in spite of their intrinsic value to general history, they were not useful in, or added nothing to, the political portraiture of David Wilmot. A work of this kind, to keep within any practicable bounds, must be selective. The selections made to round out the picture of Wilmot as a politician speak for themselves. I did not, indeed, attempt the sterile task of listing the works known but unquoted, or of undertaking a bibliography. That, as the reviewer must know, would simply catalogue almost the entire politico-historical literature of the period, to the consternation of the reader and the despair of the publisher.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BUXTON GOING.

NEW YORK,

October 28, 1925.

HISTORICAL NEWS

The *General Index* to vols. XXI.-XXX. of this journal, prepared by Mr. David M. Matteson, will be sent to the printer early in January, and may be expected to be ready for distribution in March. It should be mentioned that copies of the two preceding *General Indexes*, to vols. I.-X. and XI.-XX., respectively, without which, it would seem, no file of the *Review* can conveniently be used, can still be obtained from the publishers, the price being \$2.50, cloth bound, \$1.50 in paper.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Before this number of the *Review* is issued, the annual meeting of the Association will have taken place at Ann Arbor, December 29-31. From the July declaration of the Committee on Nominations it may be assumed that Professor Dana C. Munro has been elected president of the Association, Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor first vice-president. The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize has voted that it be conferred on Fred S. Rodkey for his monograph, published a year ago by the University of Illinois, on *The Turco-Egyptian Question in the Relations of England, France, and Russia, 1832-1841*, and that honorable mention be made of a manuscript on Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867, by Miss Florence E. Gillespie of the University of Chicago. The committee on the George L. Beer Prize has voted that it be awarded to Miss Edith P. Stickney, of Goucher College, for a manuscript on Southern Albania or Northern Epirus in *European International Affairs, 1912-1923*. The Council has voted that the Jusserand medal, for the best work in the field of cultural relations between the United States and any European country, be awarded to Professor Bernard Faÿ for his much-admired book on *L'Esprit Révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la Fin du XVIII^e Siècle* (Paris, Champion; see this journal, XXX. 810).

The committee having the matter in charge, on behalf of the Conference of Historical Societies, has now completed arrangements for printing the *Handbook of Historical Societies*, which it has long had in preparation. The book will be ready for distribution by February 1. Orders for copies, at the price of \$1, should be sent, with remittance, to the office of the Treasurer of this Association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. The *Handbook* will contain many useful data respecting most of those historical societies in the United States which are in active existence.

PERSONAL

Professor Albert T. Clay, who for fifteen years had been professor of Assyriology and Babylonian literature in Yale University, and was

noted for many valuable writings in the field of Babylonian and Assyrian history, and especially for his editions of documents and his *Empire of the Amorites*, died on September 14, at the age of fifty-eight.

Rev. Dr. William M. Beauchamp of Syracuse, for many years archaeologist of the New York State Museum, died on December 13, at the age of ninety-five. In a long life of active research in the history and antiquities of central New York, he had produced, among other books, *A History of the New York Iroquois* (1905), and a multitude of articles chiefly in the field of Indian archaeology.

Dr. Paul Ferdinand Peck, professor of history in Grinnell College, Iowa, where he had taught for twenty years, died on November 20, aged fifty-two years, at Evanston, where during the present academic year he was taking the place of Professor I. J. Cox in Northwestern University.

Dr. Felix Liebermann, of Berlin, was killed by a motor car on October 7, at the age of seventy-four. His contributions to the early history of England—such as his admirable edition of the *Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (1898–1906)—and his attractive personal character, had won him high esteem in England and America as well as in Germany.

Dr. Ernest G. Hardy, principal of Jesus College, Oxford, died on October 26, at the age of seventy-three. Besides many articles in Roman history in various periodicals, most of which were collected into two volumes of *Studies in Roman History* (1907, 1910), he published in 1924 *Some Problems in Roman History*, ten further essays.

John William Graham, of Woodbrooke, England, formerly principal of Dalton Hall at the University of Manchester, is now at Swarthmore College as the first occupant of the Howard M. Jenkins chair of Quaker history and research, recently founded by Charles F. Jenkins and family.

Professor Franklin L. Riley of Washington and Lee University is spending the present year in teaching in the University of Southern California.

At the Ohio State University, last July, Professor George W. Knight resigned the headship of the department of American history, after more than forty years' service, but continues as a professor, giving his regular courses. The departments of American and European history have recently been joined into one department. Professor W. H. Siebert, who for nearly twenty-five years has been the head of the department of European history, has been appointed research professor in history and Professor Carl Wittke chairman of the new department of history.

Professor L. M. Larson of the University of Illinois is on leave of absence during the present academic year, and Professor A. H. Lybyer is acting head of the department of history. Dr. J. W. Swain of the same university has been promoted to an assistant professorship.

Professor Marion Dargan, recently of the Concord State Teachers College of West Virginia, has been appointed head of the department of

history in Illinois College, taking the place of G. R. Poage, who resigns to accept an appointment as professor of history in the College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Texas.

Dr. C. C. Regier, formerly connected with Muskingum College in Ohio, has been made head of the historical department of Albion College in Michigan.

Professor W. S. Davis of the University of Minnesota is on leave of absence during the present academic year.

Dr. Louis Pelzer of the University of Iowa has been given the full rank of professor.

Dr. Thomas P. Martin, associate professor of American history in the University of Texas, has leave of absence for the year 1925-1926, with a research fellowship of the Social Science Research Council, and is making a study of Anglo-American relations in the twenty years before the Civil War, as influenced by economic, social, and political forces.

Professor Samuel R. Gammon, jr., of Austin College, has been appointed head of the department of history in the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

Willis G. Swartz, formerly of the University of Iowa, has been made head of the historical department of Sterling College in Kansas.

Professors W. F. Galpin of the University of Oklahoma, R. C. McGrane of the University of Cincinnati, E. M. Coulter of the University of Georgia, J. D. Barnhart of Indiana University, and E. W. Nelson of Cornell University will teach this year in the summer school of the University of Nebraska.

GENERAL

Through a subvention of \$5000 a year for three years the American Council of Learned Societies will be able to offer in 1926, 1927, and 1928 a number of small grants (not exceeding \$300) for the purpose of aiding scholars who require assistance in the conduct of projects of research in the humanistic and social sciences. Grants will be made only to mature scholars, experienced in scientific methods of research, and for specific purposes (travel, assistance, copies, photographs, appliances, etc.) in connection with definite projects. Grants will not be available for work the object of which is to fulfill the requirements for any academic degree, and in general preference will be given to applicants who are not eligible to benefit from special funds for research such as those maintained by certain universities. The awards for 1926 will be made by April 1, by the Committee on Aid to Research of the American Council of Learned Societies: Professors Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., chairman, Edwin F. Gay, Harvard University, Edwin Greenlaw, Johns Hopkins University, Gordon J. Laing, University of Chicago, and Frederick J. E. Woodbridge, Columbia University. Ap-

plications for grants in 1926 must be in the hands of the chairman of the committee by February 28. Scholars who wish to make such applications should secure the circular *Information to Applicants* from the chairman of the committee or from Waldo G. Leland, 1133 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., who during the past year has been executive secretary of the Council.

By invitation of the University of London, an Anglo-American Historical Conference will be held at the Institute of Historical Research during the week beginning July 12, 1926. Formal invitations to nominate representatives have been sent to various universities, and all historians and university teachers of history who happen to be in England at that time will be welcome. Those who desire to attend should send their names to the Secretary of the Conference, Institute of Historical Research, Malet Street, London, W.C.1.

A summer school, of a type not unlike that of the summer sessions in American universities, has been established for American students at Trinity College, Dublin, to open on July 15, 1926, and to continue till August 31. In history, Miss Constantia Maxwell of the University of Dublin will lecture in modern French history, Mr. Edmund Curtis of Keble College, Oxford, on Anglo-Irish history, and it is hoped that Dr. Ernest Barker, principal of King's College, London, will be able to give a course in modern English history.

The *Union List of Serials* in the libraries of the United States and Canada, which is being edited by Winifred Gregory, under the direction of a committee of the American Library Association, has already progressed sufficiently to be of great service to historical scholars. It contains a record of all serials (periodicals and society publications) in nearly two hundred of our large libraries, giving a complete bibliographical statement and the location of copies. The provisional edition has been published through the letter I, and the complete alphabet will be finished, it is hoped, within a year. The final and corrected edition should appear within the year following. The *List* is being published by the H. W. Wilson Company, of New York.

The publisher Alfred A. Knopf is planning the publication of a series of college history texts to be known as the Borzoi Historical Series. The general editor of the series will be Professor Harry E. Barnes, who will contribute volumes on the History of Historical Writing, and on the Intellectual Development of Western Society. Definite arrangements have been made for other volumes of the series, as follows: a History of the Middle Ages, by Professor James W. Thompson of Chicago; a History of Europe from 1500 to 1815, by James E. Gillespie of Pennsylvania State College; a History of the Modern World, 1776-1925, by Alexander C. Flick, state historian of New York; a Diplomatic History of Europe, 1870-1925, by William L. Langer of Clark University; a

History of England by William T. Morgan of Indiana University; a Political and Social History of the United States by Harold U. Faulkner of Smith College, and a History of Latin-America by J. Fred Rippy of Chicago. A volume by Professor Rippy on *The United States and Mexico*, covering diplomatic relations, has just been published by the same firm.

Vol. I. of the *Histoire Générale des Peuples*, edited by Maxime Petit, covers antiquity and the Middle Ages. Its several sections are the work of distinguished specialists (Paris, Larousse, 1925, pp. xii, 388).

The whole range of European economic history from ancient times to the World War was laid under contribution by the distinguished scholar Max Weber, in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, posthumously published (Tübingen, Mohr, 1924, pp. iv, 556).

The Thomas Y. Crowell Company has reissued its English translation of Victor Duruy's *General History of the World*, formerly revised and continued to 1901 by Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor, and now brought down to date by Mabel S. C. Smith and J. Walker McSpadden. The original work, running to 1848, and published some seventy years ago, occupies about two-thirds of the present book of 931 pages.

The October number of the *Historical Outlook* contains an interesting and valuable contribution from Professor Louis M. Sears concerning the observations of the London *Times's* American Correspondent in 1861. This correspondent was William H. Russell, whose *Diary* is a recognized source for the Civil War. Russell's correspondence with J. C. Bancroft Davis, sometime regular New York correspondent of the *Times*, constitutes a definite addition to the record of his study of conditions in this country at the outbreak of the war, and several of these letters have been embodied by Professor Sears in his article. In the November number is a study, by Professor George B. Manhart of De Pauw University, of the European Elections of 1924-1925. Professor Richard H. Shyrock, of Duke University, has added very greatly to the usefulness of any teacher's file of the *History Teacher's Magazine* and *Historical Outlook* by contributing to the December number, in which it fills 40 pages, a systematic guide to all the contents of the sixteen volumes of that periodical, the mention of each article of any importance being accompanied by some words of description. The same number contains a report from Professor Edgar Dawson as secretary of the National Council for the Social Studies.

The October number of *History* contains papers on Hadrian's Wall by R. G. Collingwood; on History and the Law by Professor A. F. Pollard; on the Sayings of Queen Elizabeth by Professor J. E. Neale; and on the School of Salerno by Dr. and Mrs. Charles Singer.

The *Journal of Negro History* for October presents the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, the annual report of the director, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, and a review by him of the ten years' work of collecting and publishing records of the negro which the society has carried out since its organization in 1915. There is also an article by Jane E. Adams on the Abolition of the Brazilian Slave Trade, and a continuation, through more than a hundred pages, from the *Liberator* and other anti-slavery papers, 1842-1859, of letters of negroes, especially of Frederick Douglass, illustrative of negro opinion.

Boni and Liveright have brought out a volume by Hendrik Willem Van Loon which bears the title *Tolerance*. It is described as the story of man's fight for freedom of thought.

The Manual Arts Press, Peoria, Illinois, has brought out a volume on *Historic Costume*, by Katherine M. Lester.

A book of exceptional value in its field is *The Women's Garment Workers: a History of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union* (New York, B. W. Huebsch, pp. xxv, 608), by Louis Levine.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Carlo Rostan, *Due Concezioni di Storia Universale; Orosio e Bossuet*, concl. (*Nuova Rivista Storica*, July); Jean Morellet, *Les Mouvements Migratoires Européens* (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, July-September); Roberto Michels, *Francia e Germania nella Storia* (*Nuova Antologia*, September 1).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The *Antiquaries Journal* for October presents a comprehensive report of fifty pages by Mr. C. Leonard Woolley of the excavations at Ur in 1924-1925.

To the first volume of Professor Eduard Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums* (1914) he has now, on the basis of the publications and discoveries of the last ten years, furnished a special supplement, *Die ältere Chronologie Babylonien, Assyriens, und Aegyptens* (Stuttgart, Cotta, pp. iv, 70).

The fourth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* was published by the Cambridge University Press in October. It deals with the Assyrian Empire, the Hittites, Syria, Babylonia, Israel and Judah, Lydia and Ionia, and the beginnings of the Greek world.

Messrs. Kegan Paul announce three volumes in their series, *The History of Civilization*, namely, *Mesopotamia: the Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, by Professor Delaporte, *The Aegean Civilization*, by Professor G. Glotz (these two being translations of French books in M. Berr's series, and already reviewed in these pages), and *The Peoples of Asia*, by L. H. Dudley Buxton, lecturer in physical anthropology at Oxford.

The Religious Tract Society (London) has just issued *A Century of Excavation in Palestine* by R. A. S. MacAlister, and *Egyptian Papyri and Papyrus Hunting* by James Baikie.

A History of the Pharaohs, vol. I. (*The First Eleven Dynasties*), by Arthur E. P. B. Weigall, is published in the United States by E. P. Dutton and Company.

Mrs. Winifred Brunton's *Kings and Queens of Ancient Egypt* (London, Hodder and Stoughton) reproduces in color the original portraits of these monarchs, and is accompanied by biographies by Professor J. H. Breasted, Professor T. E. Peet, and others.

Fascicle 24 of the Publications of the Faculty of Letters of Strasbourg is a large and handsomely illustrated volume, entitled *Les Scènes de la Vie Privée dans les Tombeaux Égyptiens de l'Ancien Empire*, by Pierre Montet (Strasbourg, Istra, pp. xviii, 430).

Das Hellenische Thessalien; Landeskundliche und Geschichtliche Beschreibung Thessaliens in der Hellenischen und Römischen Zeit, by Friedrich Stählin (Stuttgart, Engelhorn, 1924, pp. xxiii, 245), has received the highest praise; it is said that no work comparable to it has appeared since Curtius's account of the Peloponnesos nearly seventy-five years ago.

E. P. Dutton and Company have published a history of early Rome presented in the light of modern archaeological discovery by Mrs. Ida Thallon Hill, formerly associate professor of history in Vassar College, *Rome of the Kings, an Archaeological Setting for Livy and Vergil*.

Professor Friedrich von Woess of Innsbruck, who recently made a notable study of certain legal institutions in Ptolemaic Egypt, has published *Untersuchungen über das Urkundenwesen und den Publizitätsschutz im Römischen Aegypten*, based on a still more complete investigation of the papyri (Munich, Beck, 1924, pp. xxi, 389); the volume is Heft 6 of the *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ulrich Wilcken, *Punt-Fahrten in der Ptolemäerzeit* (*Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, LX.); W. E. Crum, *Koptische Zünfte und das Pfeffermonopol* (*ibid.*); Marga Hirsch, *Die Athenischen Tyrannenmörder in Geschichtsschreibung und Volkslegende* (*Klio*, XX. 2); B. D. Merritt, *Tribute Assessment in the Athenian Empire from 454 to 440 B. C.* (*American Journal of Archaeology*, July-September); Helmut Berve, *Die Angebliche Begründung des Hellenistischen Königs Kultes durch Alexander* (*Klio*, XX. 2); Fritz Geyer, *Der Hellenistische Staat, ein Vorläufer des Modernen Absoluten Staates* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXII. 3); Ernst Honigmann, *Zur Geographie des Ptolemaios* (*Klio*, XX. 2); G. Arthaud, *Les Étrusques* (*Mercure de France*, August 1); Werner Schur, *Zur Neronischen Orientpolitik* (*Klio*, XX. 2).

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—25.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Another of the source-volumes published by the Columbia University Press in the series called *Records of Civilization* is *The See of Peter*, prepared by Professor J. T. Shotwell and Miss Louise R. Loomis, professor of history in Wells College.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Stuart Jones, *The Apostles in Rome* (Quarterly Review, October); J. P. Waltzing, *Le Crime Rituel reproché aux Chrétiens du II^e Siècle* (Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, Académie Royale de Belgique, 1925, 5).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The American journal of medieval studies which has been heretofore announced as in preparation, under the best of auspices, is to be entitled *Speculum*. The first number is expected to appear in January.

The late Rev. Dr. Adrian Fortescue, professor of ecclesiastical history in St. Edmund's College, Ware, had nearly completed at the time of his death a new edition of Boethius *De Consolatione*, with learned notes and other apparatus. Professor George D. Smith of the same college has supplied an elaborate Latin introduction and brought the book to publication, *Anici Manli Severini Boethi de Consolatione Philosophiae Libri Quinque*, etc. (London, Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, pp. xlviii, 225).

The fifth volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History*, a volume dealing with the period of the Crusades, will be published shortly—perhaps at the time of our issue has already been published—by the Cambridge University Press.

Rev. Edward H. R. Tatham, canon of Lincoln Cathedral, has put forth the first volume of an extensive work entitled *Francesco Petrarca, the First Modern Man of Letters: his Life and Correspondence* (London, Sheldon Press). In this volume the early years and the lyric poems are treated, with insight and abundant learning.

Professor A. Hyma of the University of North Dakota has given further illustration of the history of the Brethren of the Common Life by printing, in the *Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het Aartsbisdom Utrecht*, the text of the treatise "Super Modo Vivendi Devotorum Hominum simul Commorantium" by Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. P. Whitney, *Peter Damiani and Humbert* (Cambridge Historical Journal, I. 3); L. Costanzo, *Il "Profeta" Calabrese* [the abbot Joachim] (Nuova Antologia, October 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Professor Ferdinand Schevill of Chicago is the author of *A History of Europe from the Reformation to the Present Day*, which has been published by the firm of Harcourt.

The classical essay of Copernicus on money, written about 1526, and first published in 1816, *Monetae Cudendae Ratio*, of which all reprints have become rare, has been reissued by the Warsaw Faculty of Commerce in an edition prepared by Professor Jan Dmochowski, *Nikolaja Kopernika Rozprawy o Monecie* (Warsaw, Geberthner and Wolff, pp. clxix, 223). The edition contains the original Latin and German texts, as well as a Polish translation, and a long monograph by the editor on the monetary theories of Copernicus and their origin.

Professor Edgar Prestage is publishing at about this time a volume on the *Diplomatic Relations of Portugal with France, England, and Holland from 1641 to 1668* (Watford, Voss and Michael).

In a volume entitled *Les Relations de Voyages du XVII^e Siècle et l'Évolution des Idées* (Paris, Champion), M. Geoffroy Atkinson makes an important and interesting contribution to the history of thought in the ensuing age, in the formation of whose opinions and philosophy the narratives and descriptions of the travellers form a notable factor.

The house of Jonathan Cape has published this autumn the *Diary of Princess Lieven*, edited by Harold Temperley, heretofore announced in these pages.

The last ambassador of France at Vienna, Alfred Dumaine, writes of *Choses d'Allemagne* (Paris, Fayard, 1925, pp. 288); another volume of *Souvenirs Diplomatiques* is entitled *En Suède pendant la Guerre Mondiale*, by A. Nekludoff, with preface by Gabriel Hanotaux (Paris, Perrin, 1925).

Friedrich, Ritter von Lama, is publishing in serial parts an important history of papal policy with respect to the ending of the World War and since that event, *Papst und Kurie in ihrer Politik seit dem Weltkriege* (Illertissen, Bavaria, Martinus).

Europäische Gespräche for September prints (in German) the Chamberlain secret memorandum of Feb. 20, 1925, the report of the Mosul Commission of the League of Nations, and the Indian government's rejection of the Geneva protocol, as well as a twenty-page bibliography of books and articles on international relations published in 1925.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Kaegi, *Hutten und Erasmus*, concl. (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, XXII. 4); A. C. Wood, *The English Embassy at Constantinople, 1660-1762* (*English Historical Review*, October); Sir E. Satow, *Pacta sunt Servanda, or International Guarantee* [especially respecting the neutrality of Luxemburg] (*Cambridge Historical Journal*, I. 3); Sir Henry Thornton, *A Century of Steam Railway Development* (*Dalhousie Review*, October); "Asecretis", *Polen und Lothringen; ein Diplomatisches Thema* (*Europäische Gespräche*, September); A. Augustin-Thierry, *La Princesse Belgiojoso et Augustin Thierry; Lettres Inédites*, I.-IV. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, September

1-October 15); W. L. Langer, *The Franco-Russian Alliance*, II. (Slavonic Review, June); Ange Morre, *La Démocratie Européenne au XX^e Siècle*, I.-VI. (Nouvelle Revue, July 15-October 15).

THE WORLD WAR

The Naval War College's volume for 1923 of *International Law Decisions and Notes* (pp. vii, 224) contains the text of some twenty-four prize cases, American, English, German, and Japanese, arising from the recent war.

The War Department has issued vol. II. of the *Report of the Military Board of Allied Supply*, relating to the allied armies under Marshal Foch in the Franco-Belgian theatre of operations (pp. viii, 1173).

Messrs. McClurg of Chicago have published an anonymous account of a quite extraordinary episode of the World War, *Archangel: the American War with Russia*, by "a Chronicler".

Don Ernesto Vercesi's *Il Vaticano, l'Italia, e la Guerra* (Milan, Mondadori), the work of a Catholic priest whose sympathies are with the Allied Powers, gives an approving history of the policy of the Holy See from the beginning to the end of the war.

A reinforced and amplified edition of Aldo Valori's *La Guerra Italo-Austriaca, 1915-1918*, has appeared; also a new work with the same title by Amadeo Tosti, signalized as being based on Austrian as well as Italian documents, many hitherto unutilized, and containing an excellent co-ordination of events on the Italian front with those on other fronts.

With the British Battle Fleet: War Recollections of a Russian Naval Officer (London, Hutchinson) is a valuable book of reminiscences, by an intelligent and fair-minded naval man, Commodore G. von Schoultz, who was Russian liaison officer to the British Grand Fleet, and is now commander-in-chief of the Finnish navy.

A naval history of the Great War has been published in Italy by Mondadori at Milan: Ettore Bravetta, *La Grande Guerra sul Mare*.

In the *Collection de Mémoires, Études et Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de la Guerre Mondiale*, Capt. A. Thomazi supplies the first thorough study which *La Guerre Navale dans l'Adriatique* has thus far received (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 256).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Raymond Poincaré, *The Responsibility for the War* (Foreign Affairs, October); Josef Pekar, *Nochmals die Kriegsschuld* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, September); Max Montgelas, *Der Grundirrtum Prof. Pekars* (*ibid.*); S. Rupprich, *Der Anteil der Serbischen Presse am Ausbruch des Weltkrieges* (*ibid.*); A. Weber, *Die Kriegsschuldfrage in Ungarn* (*ibid.*); H. Lutz, *Churchill's Befehl vom 30. Juli, 1914* (*ibid.*); Friedrich R. von Wiesner, *The Forged and the Genuine Text of the "Wiesner Documents"* (*ibid.*, October);

Weitere Ausschnitte zum Attentat von Sarajevo [translation of Borivoje Jevtić's pamphlet, to be continued] (*ibid.*).

GREAT BRITAIN

Under the editorial care of Dr. Hubert Hall, literary director of the Royal Historical Society, the society has published *A List and Index of the Publications of the Royal Historical Society, 1871-1924*, and of the *Camden Society, 1840-1897* (pp. xvii, 110), the list giving in detail the contents of each composite volume, and the index of authors, editors, and titles being followed by an index of names, places, and subjects.

Dr. Chalfant Robinson of Princeton has in press (Princeton University Press) an edition of the Pipe Roll of 14 Henry III. He is also preparing an edition of the Pipe Roll of 14 Edward II.

The next volume in the series of *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*, edited by Sir Paul Vinogradoff, and published by the Oxford University Press, will contain *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267; the Provisions of Oxford and Local Reform; the Rebellion viewed in the Legal Records of 1265-1267*, by E. F. Jacob.

The third volume of R. T. Gunther's *Early Science in Oxford* (Oxford, printed for the subscribers) deals with the biological sciences.

The second volume of Professor Edward P. Cheyney's *History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth*, completing the work, will soon be published by Messrs. Longmans.

Dr. Conyers Read's *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, published in England by the Oxford University Press, as heretofore announced in these pages, is published in the United States by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dr. Henry Hamilton, lecturer in economics in the University of Birmingham, has lately published a volume on *The English Brass and Copper Industries, to 1800* (Longmans), beginning *temp. Eliz.* and giving especial attention to the development of these industries in Birmingham.

Dr. John W. Draper, professor of English in the University of Maine, has issued from the New York University Press a volume entitled *William Mason: a Study in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (pp. xvi, 397), planned and executed as a contribution toward evaluation of the rank and file of eighteenth-century life and thought; it is conceded that the Rev. William Mason personally stood not much above the grade of the commonplace, but it is maintained that, as a thinker, as a dilettante in many arts, and as a man living among men and acquainted with almost everyone of distinction in his generation, he fairly represents the average of his period and social class, and may therefore be a source of instruction, through this elaborate and careful book, to the student of history.

The annual Raleigh Lecture before the British Academy was this season given, on October 28, by Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, formerly professor of history in the University of Minnesota, the subject being "Lord Shelburne and the Founding of British-American Goodwill".

Any historian observing economic developments in England since the war would naturally feel a desire to know more of the phenomena of the period following the Napoleonic wars. Mr. A. W. Ackworth deals carefully with one aspect of this theme in a small volume on *Financial Reconstruction in England, 1815-1822* (London, P. S. King).

Mr. D. C. Somervell has produced a book of unusual character, which he calls "a duo-biographical sketch"—and it is an entertaining and instructive one—in his *Disraeli and Gladstone* (London, Jarrolds).

The volume of *Memorials of Albert Venn Dicey* (Macmillan) consists mainly of extracts from his thoughtful and delightful letters and diaries, compiled by Professor R. S. Rait of Glasgow, and containing, besides much that is of interest to the student of the English constitution, many exceedingly interesting notes and reflections on the United States, the fruit of two visits, one in 1870, the other in 1898.

Sir Almeric FitzRoy, clerk of the Privy Council from 1898 to 1923, puts forth two volumes of *Memoirs* (London, Hutchinson), which, *mutatis mutandis*, have much of the same sort of interest which attaches to the diaries of Charles Greville.

The Oxford University Press has just published, in three volumes, *The Life of Henry Howard Molyneux Herbert, Fourth Earl of Carnarvon, 1831-1890*, by Sir Arthur Hardinge, edited by Lord Carnarvon's widow, the Dowager Countess of Carnarvon.

Social and Diplomatic Memories, 1902-1919 (Longmans, pp. xii, 404), by Sir James Rennell Rodd, is a third volume of his series, completing the record of his experiences during thirty-seven years of active life, and dealing especially with Rome, Italy, and the Great War.

In the *Scottish Historical Review* for October Mr. J. D. Mackie prints, from the Fortescue papers in the Bodleian Library, "A Loyal Subjectes Advertiment" as to the unpopularity of the government of James I. in England during its first year, and comments ably upon it; Professor R. K. Hannay presents a Study in Reformation History, concerned with the relations, especially the financial relations, between James V. and the papacy under Clement VII.

Vol. II., part IV., of the *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, published for the University of Wales by the Oxford University Press, contains an extensive bibliography of published works on the municipal history of Wales and the Border, compiled by William Rees, with special reference to the published records.

The History of the Quakers in Wales and their Emigration to North America, by Rev. T. Mardy Rees, has been published in Carmarthen by Spurrell.

British government publications: *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI.*, vol. III., 1549-1551; *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, vol. XXVI., 1642-1643.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. H. E. Craster, *The Red Book of Durham* (English Historical Review, October); Alex. Cartellieri, *Richard Löwenherz* (Probleme der Englischen Sprache und Kultur: Festschrift für Johannes Hoops); J. F. Rees, *The Phases of British Commercial Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Economica, June).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 410; for India, see p. 395.)

Mention was made in these pages, soon after the event, of the destruction, by the revolutionaries, in June, 1922, of the Irish archives housed in the Public Record Office of Ireland, at Dublin. The Public Record Office of Northern Ireland is endeavoring to repair in part this disaster to learning by obtaining copies of any of the destroyed records relating to Ulster, to the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Down, Fermanagh, Londonderry, and Tyrone, or to the cities of Belfast and Londonderry. Any readers who have in their possession copies of records of such a sort are invited to deposit them in the new Record Office, or allow copies to be made for it. Such persons are requested to communicate with Mr. D. A. Chart, Deputy Keeper of the Records, Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, Murray Street, Belfast.

The firm of Longmans has published *Gleanings from Irish History*, by William F. Butler.

Sir James O'Connor, one of the Lords Justices of Appeal in Ireland from 1918 to 1924, has written a volume of *History of Ireland, 1789-1924*, lately published in London by Edward Arnold.

A plan has been formed for a *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, in six volumes, to be edited by Professor J. Holland Rose, Professor A. P. Newton of the University of London, and Mr. E. A. Benians of St. John's College, Cambridge, with Professor W. P. M. Kennedy of Toronto as Canadian adviser for volume IV., which will be devoted to the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland. Volume V. is assigned to Australia and New Zealand; volume VI. to South Africa. The first three volumes will be more general, dealing with the history of the British government of the Empire, trade, economics, general wars, crown colonies, and those of America. It is hoped that the first volume will be published in 1927.

Dr. M. H. de Kock's volume entitled *Selected Subjects in the Economic History of South Africa* (Cape Town and Johannesburg, Juta, pp. vii, 475) is in fact a good treatment of all the most important topics within the field indicated by its title.

The Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament has published vol. XXIV. of *Historical Records of Australia: Governor's Despatches to and from England*, October, 1844, to March, 1846 (pp. xvii, 936).

The June number of the *Victorian Historical Magazine* includes among its articles: Three Incidents in Victorian History, by Professor Ernest Scott; the Overlanders, part I., by A. S. Kenyon; and Reminiscences from 1841 of William Kyle, a Pioneer, communicated to and transcribed by Charles Daley.

It is announced in the *Cambridge Historical Journal* that additional transfers of Colonial Office papers from the Public Record Office to Cambridge Prison have now been made, of such extent that for all colonies except those that now form the United States the body of Colonial Office papers—acts, sessional papers, gazettes, newspapers, shipping returns, blue books of statistics, and miscellaneous volumes—are now to be found in Cambridge, where they can, in the case of nearly all colonies, be consulted for all years down to about 1895.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. A. Benians, *Adam Smith's Project of an Empire* (*Cambridge Historical Journal*, I. 3).

FRANCE

General review: H. Hauser, *Histoire de France, 1494-1661* (*Revue Historique*, November-December).

An *Histoire Militaire et Navale*, part I., constitutes vol. VII. of Gabriel Hanotaux's *Histoire de la Nation Française*; it, in turn, is in two parts, *Des Origines aux Croisades*, by Gen. J. Colin, *Des Croisades à la Révolution*, by Col. F. Reboul (Paris, Plon, 1925, pp. 600).

The *Histoire Générale du Droit Français, des Origines à 1789, à l'Usage des Étudiants des Facultés de Droit* (Paris, Sirey, 1925, pp. viii, 1076), is an excellent manual by Professor J. Declareuil of Toulouse, having obvious utility for students of history as well as of law.

An important recent publication is Frantz Funck-Brentano's *Les Origines* (Paris, Hachette, 1925), completing to the nineteenth century the series *Histoire de France racontée à Tous*, in which are included the excellent volumes on the Renaissance by Batiffol and the Revolution by Madelin.

An important study in the culture of one of the most obscure races of Europe is *La Tombe Basque; Recueil d'Inscriptions Funéraires et Domestiques du Pays Basque Français*, by Louis Colas, with preface by

Camille Jullian (Paris, Champion, 1906-1924, 2 vols. fol., I., pp. xxi, 93; II., atlas, pp. 404 of illustrations and text).

Messrs. Macmillan of London have lately published *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age*, by the late Sir Samuel Dill.

Mr. Charles Shepard of 2153 California street, Washington, D. C., publishes in a tabular review *The Lineage of the Counts of Anjou from Ingelger to Geoffrey Plantagenet*.

In Messrs. Routledge's "Broadway Translations" are lately issued the *Autobiography of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent*, translated by C. S. S. Bland, and *A Huguenot Family in the XVI. Century: the Memoirs of Philippe de Mornay, Sieur du Plessis Marly*, translated by Lucy Crump.

The third and last volume of the critical edition of the *Commentaires de Blaise de Monluc, Maréchal de France*, with notes by Professor Paul Courteault of Bordeaux, covers the years 1563-1576 (Paris, Picard, 1925, pp. xii, 587); a very complete index and a glossary aid in giving this edition considerable importance for the study of the religious wars and of sixteenth-century language.

The house of Hachette has commenced a new collection, called *Récits d'Autrefois*, in which specialists will discuss in detail certain famous crises in French history. In this series, J. Bainville has already written of the 18 Brumaire; now Louis Batiffol, the principal authority on the reign of Louis XIII., presents *La Journée des Dupes* (Paris, 1925, pp. 125), in which he reaches new conclusions.

The Société de l'Histoire de France publishes the *Correspondance Authentique de Godefroi, Comte d'Estrades*, vol. I., 1637-1646 (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xliii, 337), an important soldier and diplomat in the reigns of Louis XIII. and XIV., 556 of whose letters, instructions, and reports have been skillfully edited by A. de Saint-Léger and L. Lemaire.

Bougainville's account of his expedition around the world is a happy choice with which to inaugurate a collection of *Voyages de Jadis et d'Aujourd'hui*; it is issued under the title *Voyage de Bougainville autour du Monde pendant les Années 1766, 1767, 1768, et 1769*, with preface and notes by P. Deslandres (Paris, Roger, 1925, pp. 304).

The First Napoleon (London, Constable) is a collection of unpublished documents from the papers of Lord Lansdowne at Bowood, edited by Lord Lansdowne's son, the Earl of Kerry. The most numerous and valuable come from the Comte de Flahault, Lord Lansdowne's grandfather; others from his great-grandfather Admiral Lord Keith.

Joseph Turquan, author of *Les Soeurs de Napoléon* in two volumes, gives a documented account of Josephine in *La Générale Bonaparte* (Paris, Tallandier, 1925).

Sir Plunket Barton's third volume, *Bernadotte, Prince and King, 1810-1844* (London, Murray), has now been published, completing the biography.

A translation of Count Molé's memoirs (*vide* XXVIII. 797, XXIX. 598, XXX. 360, *ante*), *The Life and Memoirs of Count Molé (1781-1855)*, in two volumes, is published in New York by the firm of Doran.

The series *Figures du Passé*, in which appeared the well-known lives of Mirabeau by Barthou, of Danton by Madelin, and of Gambetta by Deschanel, is further extended by a study of *Le Duc de Morny* at the hands of Marcel Boulenger (Paris, Hachette, 1925).

Messrs. Heinemann announce the first two volumes of *Letters of Raymond Poincaré*, translated by Sir George Arthur, dealing largely with events leading up to the World War.

Two of the regional monographs which increase, while making more accurate, the labors of the general historian, are *Les Origines du Bourbonnais*, by Max Fazy, archivist of the department of Allier (Paris, Ficker, 1925, 2 vols., pp. 900), and *La Révolution dans le Comté de Nice et la Principauté de Monaco, 1792-1800*, by Professor Joseph Combet of Nice (Paris, Alcan, 1925, pp. xxviii, 528).

In the field of local French history, the following publications may be mentioned: Yvonne Bezard, *L'Assistance à Versailles sous l'Ancien Régime et pendant la Révolution* (Versailles, Dubois, 1924, pp. 140); Édouard Gérardin, *Histoire de Lorraine, Duchés, Comtés, Évêchés depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Réunion des Deux Duchés à la France* (Nancy, Berger, 1925, pp. xii, 351); Charles Weymann, *Une Ville d'Alsace au Moyen Age; Thann, Légendes et Histoire* (Nancy, Berger, pp. 415, 69 plates); A. Kleinclausz, *Histoire de Bourgogne* (Paris, Hachette, 1924, second ed., pp. viii, 454, 32 plates); A. Grimaud and M. Balmelle, *Précis de l'Histoire du Gévaudan rattachée à l'Histoire de France* (Paris, Champion, 1925, pp. viii, 368).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Léon Levillain, *Études sur l'Abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'Époque Mérovingienne* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January-June); V. Zoppi, *La Politica Europea della Francia, dai Trattati di Westfalia al Trattato di Versailles* (Nuova Antologia, July 16); F. Charles-Roux, *Le Projet Français de Commerce avec l'Inde par Suez sous le Règne de Louis XVI.*, I. (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies, XIII. 3); L. R. Gottschalk, *Communism during the French Revolution* (Political Science Quarterly, September); A. Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Subsistances: la Répression de l'Hébertisme* (Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française, September); G. Hanotaux, *La Politique Intérieure sous le Premier Empire*, I.-III. (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15, October 1, 15); P. Gautier, *Le Comte d'Haussonville et Madame de Staël* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 15); Chateaubriand, *Lettres à la Comtesse de Castellane*, I., concl. (Revue de Paris, August 1, 15, September 1); G. de Grandmaison, *L'Expédition Française en Espagne en 1823*, I., concl. (*ibid.*, September 15, October 1); Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, *Lamartine et la Politique* (*ibid.*, July 15);

Émile Ollivier, *Journal Intime*, I.-IV. (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15-September 1); A. Maréchal, *Souvenirs et Impressions du Blocus de Metz*, 1870, II., concl. (Nouvelle Revue, July 15-October 15); G. Bourgin, *La Commune de Paris et le Comité Central*, 1871 (Revue Historique, September).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: Luis Araujo-Costa, *Courrier Espagnol* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

The Rumanian School of Rome, founded in 1921 for the study of archaeology, history, and belles-lettres, has just published the first two volumes of its *Anuario*, under the title *Ephemeris Dacoromana* (Rome, Libreria di Scienze e Lettere, 2 vols., I., 1923, pp. ix, 413; II., 1924, pp. 500). They contain long and erudite studies, printed in Italian, by members of the school, illustrated where needful by photographs and charts; the presswork of the volumes is admirable. The contents of volume I., after an introduction by the director, Vasile Pârvan, are as follows: Paul Nicorescu, *La Tomba degli Scipioni*; G. G. Mateescu, *I Traci nelle Epigrafi di Roma*; S. Bezdeki, *Ioannes Chrysostomos e Plato*; A. Marcu, *Riflessi di Storia Rumena in Opere Italiane dei Secoli XIV. e XV.*; Em. Panaitescu, *Il Ritratto di Decebalo*. Vol. II. contains A. Busuioceanu, *Un Ciclo di Affreschi del Secolo XI.*; A. Marcu, *La Spagna ed il Portogallo nella Visione dei Romantici Italiani*; G. G. Mateescu, *Nomi Traci nel Territorio Scito Sarmatico*; S. Bezdeki, *Nicephori Gregorae Epistulae XC.*; P. Nicorescu, *Scavi e Scoperte a Tyras*; Em. Panaitescu, *Fidenae*; C. Isopescu, *Alcuni Documenti inediti della Fine del Cinquecento*.

Heft 68 of the *Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte*, edited by von Below, Finke, and Meinecke, is a study of the social organization which preceded the rise of the Italian cities, by Fedor Schneider, entitled *Die Entstehung von Burg und Landgemeinde in Italien; Studien zur Historischen Geographie, Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1924, pp. xviii, 326).

Mr. Selwyn Brinton's *The Golden Age of the Medici* (London, Methuen) deals with the period from 1434 to 1494, and emphasizes the relations of the Medici to art and literature.

A life of Pietro Paleocapa, the Venetian co-worker with Cavour in preparing Piedmont for its mission in the unification of Italy, by Giorgio Colabich, has been published posthumously by the son of the author. In his studies of Paleocapa the elder Colabich used documents placed at his disposal by the family.

Professor Saverio Cilibrizzi has published the second volume of his *Storia Parlamentare Politica e Diplomatica d'Italia, da Novara a Vittorio Veneto*. This volume covers the period 1870-1896.

The historical office of the Italian General Staff has added to its publications a study by A. Vigeveno of *La Legione Ungherese in Italia, 1859-1867*, and the third volume of its *Campagna di Libia*.

Antonio Mosconi's *I Primi Anni di Governo Italiano nella Venezia Giulia* is a book by the High Commissioner of the region during the period covered and is therefore of interest as an historical record.

Anything written by Signor Benedetto Croce deserves attention. A solid contribution to history lately made by him is his *Storia del Regno di Napoli* (Bari, Laterza).

Vol. LII of the *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* is entitled *Miscellanea Geo-Topografica* (Genoa, 1924, pp. 422) and is dedicated to various aspects of the history of Genoa. Among other notable articles, there is an important general review by Francesco Poggi and Heinrich Sieveking, of recent foreign publications on the medieval commerce of Genoa, 28 pages of which are given to the work of Professor Eugene H. Byrne of the University of Wisconsin.

The eleventh centenary of the Ateneo Pavese has produced two contributions to the history of the University of Pavia: *Statuti e Ordinamenti della Università di Pavia dall'anno 1361 all'anno 1859*, and *Contributi alla Storia dell'Università di Pavia*. A volume of five essays by G. M. Monti, *Per la Storia dell'Università di Napoli*, has been published at Naples.

The most recent contributions to the regional history of Italy are Andrea Balletti's *Storia di Reggio nell'Emilia*, noteworthy as the pioneer attempt to write a comprehensive history of the local community; the second volume of the sixth edition of Molmenti's *La Storia di Venezia*, a work that has been greatly enriched in each successive edition; and a new edition of L. Franchetti and S. Sonnino, *La Sicilia*.

Vol. II. of the *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* (Madrid, *Revista de Archivos*, 1925, pp. 562) sustains the high standard of its predecessor; its *pièce de résistance* is a long study by Ramón Carande on the municipal organization of Seville in the fourteenth century; among other noteworthy articles are those of the Austrian scholar, Alfons Dopsch, on the capitulary *De Villis*, of J. M. Ots Capdequí on the law of property in the Spanish Indies, particularly during the sixteenth century, and of Henri Sée on trade relations between Brittany and Cadiz in the eighteenth century. The publishers of the *Anuario* have decided to add to their annual a collection of special studies, the first of which is an *Historia de las Instituciones Sociales y Políticas de España y Portugal durante los Siglos V. á XIV.* (Madrid, *ibid.*, 1925, pp. 330), the translation of an unpublished German work by Ernst Mayer, well known for his histories of Italian and French medieval institutions. A second volume will complete this monograph.

The Faculty of Law of the University of Barcelona plans a series of juridical texts and of monographs on the history of Spanish law. The first of these, edited by Galo Sánchez, is the *Libro de los Fueros de Castiella* (Barcelona, 1924, pp. xvi, 167), the oldest existing compilation of Castilian law, dating from the thirteenth century and hitherto unpublished.

In the *Cartulario de San Pedro de Arlanza, Antiguo Monasterio Benedictino* (Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1925, pp. xvi, 299), Dom Luciano Serrano furnishes the text of 161 documents from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, of great interest to the student of medieval Spain.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Lupo, *I Normanni di Sicilia di Fronte al Papato* (Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale, XX. 1-3); J. U. Bergkamp, O. P., *Savonarola in the Light of Modern Research* (Catholic Historical Review, October); Seb. Deledda, *Motivi Antifrancesi in Sardegna nel Secolo XVIII.* (Rivista d'Italia, September 15); Albert Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie, 1806-1807*, I., II. (Napoléon, September, November); Ersilio Michel, *Una Supplica di Carlo Alberto a Pio VII., 1822* (Nuova Antologia, October 16); Maurice Paléologue, *Un Grand Réaliste: Cavour*, I. *La Jeunesse*, II. *Cavour et le Sphinx* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 15, November 1); H. N. Gay, *Cavour's Tragic Love Story* (Century Magazine, December); Roberto Cantalupo, *Fascism in Italian History* (Foreign Affairs, October); R. Lantier, *Les Civilisations Néolithique et Énéolithique dans la Péninsule Ibérique* (Journal des Savants, July).

GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General reviews: G. Allemang, *Courrier Allemand* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); W. Uhlemann, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung und der Herkunft der Deutschen in Böhmen und Mähren* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 4); Hans Baron, *Zur Frage des Ursprungs des Deutschen Humanismus und seiner Religiösen Reformbestrebungen; ein Kritischer Bericht über die Neuere Literatur* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 3); Joseph Šusta, *Histoire de Tchécoslovaquie* [publications, 1904-1924], concl. (Revue Historique, September).

The *Historische Zeitschrift* has just published a comprehensive index to the thirty-four volumes of its third series thus far published, an index of great fulness and conveniently arranged, in three sections: methodical, alphabetical by authors and title, and alphabetical by subjects—*Register zu Band 97-130*, prepared by Friedrich Schneider (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, pp. x, 424).

A recent addition to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, is *Die Chronik Johannes von Winterthur*, edited by F. Baethgen and C. Brun (Berlin, Weidmann, 1924, pp. xxxvii, 332).

The Saxon Historical Commission has brought out the first volume, and has ready for print the second, of Professor K. von Amira's work on the *Sachsenspiegel*, and will soon bring out the third volume of its *Bibliographie der Sächsischen Geschichte*. The Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck has nearly finished its *Historisches Ortslexicon* for electoral Hesse. The Silesian commission, in conjunction with the provincial historical society, has begun the issue in parts, for A. D. 1338-1340, of the *Regesten zur Schlesischen Geschichte*, being vol. XXX. of the *Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae*.

Luther and the Reformation, vol. I. (*Early Life and Religious Development to 1517*), by Professor James Mackinnon of Edinburgh, is from the press of Longmans.

In celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Ranke's first published work, the Drei Masken Verlag, of Munich, begins the publication of a complete series in fifty volumes of *Leopold von Ranke's Werke*, to be critically edited by Professor Paul Joachimsen under the general advice of Professors Erich Marcks, Friedrich Meinecke, and Hermann Oncken. The first work to be published will be the *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*, in six volumes.

Important contributions to the diplomatic history of the nineteenth century are J. M. von Radowitz's *Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen*, edited by Hajo Holborn (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1925, 2 vols., pp. 372, 339), and H. Holborn's *Bismarcks Europäische Politik zu Beginn der 70er Jahre und die Mission Radowitz* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1925, pp. 148); they confirm the general accuracy of the picture presented by the German official documents.

In President Masaryk's *Die Welt-Revolution: Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen* (Berlin, Erich Reiss) the reminiscences are of political agitation before the war and of the formation of Czechoslovakia; the reflections are those of a philosopher and sociologist.

Light is thrown on the personalities of the Viennese court by the diary of Prince Joh. Jos. Khevenhüller-Metsch, 1742-1776, edited under the title *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias*, by Graf Rudolf Khevenhüller-Metsch and Dr. Hanns Schlitter (Vienna, Engelmann, 1925, pp. 463).

A second volume has been added to Paul Wernle's richly documented *Der Schweizerische Protestantismus im 18. Jahrhundert*; it deals with *Die Aufklärungsbewegung in der Schweiz* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1924, pp. xvi, 623).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Walther Müller, *Deutsches Volk und Deutsches Land im späteren Mittelalter; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Nationalen Namens* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 3); G. Beyerhaus, *Ludolf Camphausen, Staat und Wirtschaft 1848* (Deutsche

Rundschau, August); Hans Roeseler, *Die Deutsche Auswärtige Politik seit 1871*, IV. (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, August); H. O. Meisner, *Die Erinnerungen des Botschafters von Radowitz* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Hajo Holborn, *Deutschland und die Türkei, 1878-1890* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, August); Ed. von Wertheimer, *Ein K. und K. Militärattaché über das Politische Leben in Berlin, 1880-1895* (Preussische Jahrbücher, September); Walter Frank, *Hofprediger Stöcker* (*ibid.*, July); Konrad Lehmann, *Die Vorgeschichte der Krüger-depesche* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, August); F. Freiherr von der Goltz, *Generalfeldmarschall Freiherr von der Goltz als Generalgouverneur in Belgien, nach Briefen und Hinterlassenen Papieren* (Deutsche Rundschau, August).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

General review: E. Hubert, *Histoire de Belgique* [1914-1924] (Revue Historique, November-December).

No. 49 of the *Werken* of the Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht is *Het Leven van een Vloothouder* (pp. xvi, 447), being the autobiographical memoirs of the Dutch Rear-Admiral M. H. Jansen (1817-1893), edited by Mr. S. P. L'Honoré Naber. Like most other naval autobiographies it is an interesting record of service in many seas, especially near the Dutch East Indies; but Admiral Jansen's important work in relation to maritime meteorology and construction, especially construction of ironclads and torpedoes, gives it particular importance. Americans will be interested in his intimate relations with Maury from 1851 to 1866.

The Belgian Royal Academy will before long publish in its octavo series a masterly history of the Jesuits in Belgium, to the end of the reign of Albert and Isabella, by Rev. Alfred Poncelet.

The publisher G. Van Oest of Brussels and Paris has lately brought out, in his series of handsomely illustrated volumes on the history of art, *L'Architecture des Pays-Bas Méridionaux aux XVI^e, XVII^e, et XVIII^e Siècles* (pp. 250 and 56 plates) by Professor Paul Parent of the University of Brussels.

M. Alfred De Ridder, director of the archives in the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has made in *Le Mariage de Léopold II.* (Brussels, Dewit, 1925, pp. 297) a thoroughgoing study, not only of the episode indicated by the title but of the difficult relations of the Belgian government to Napoleon III.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Van der Essen, *Notre Nom National* (Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, January, 1925).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General reviews: Alfred Krarup, *Fortegnelse over Historisk Litteratur for Aaret 1921* ([Danish] Historisk Tidsskrift, Litteraturhefter, R. 9, Bd. VII.); L. Amundsen, *Norges Historie: Bibliografi for 1920-1922* ([Norwegian] Historisk Tidsskrift, R. 5, Bd. V.).

Fornvännen for 1924, the annual transactions of the Swedish Academy of History and Antiquities, has a useful paper by Adolph Schück on "Sjöbargar och Hamnstäder", a contribution to the commercial and municipal history of the North, with special reference to Visby, Kalmar, and Hedeby.

The sixteenth annual issue of *Islandica*, issued by the Cornell University Library, is a monograph on Eggert Ólafsson, author of the classical treatise on eighteenth-century Iceland, *Reise igiennem Island* (Sorø, 1772).

Den Norske Traelasthandels Historie, vol. I. (Skien, Fremskridt, pp. iv, 358), by Professor Alexander Bugge of Oslo, gives a full history of the Norwegian trade in masts and timber to England, Scotland, and other countries, from its earliest beginnings to the middle of the sixteenth century.

The University of Oslo is issuing, in three volumes, the professional correspondence of P. A. Munch, *Lærde Brev fraa og til P. A. Munch* (Oslo, Aschehoug), illustrative of the conduct of historical work in Scandinavia in the middle of the nineteenth century. Volume I. has appeared.

The latest report of the Carlsberg Foundation respecting the publication of data for commercial history derived from the records of the Sound Dues, *Tabeller over Skibsfart gennem Øresund*, indicates with regret that, owing to the appointment of the editor, Fru Nina Bang, to the position of Danish minister of education, the management of the enterprise must be suspended for the present without further printing, though the manuscript has been prepared to the year 1783, almost completely.

Russian literature has a peculiarly intimate connection with Russian social development. Those interested in the history of that country will, therefore, welcome the clear-cut *Geschichte der Russischen Literatur* by Arthur Luther (Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut, 1924, pp. ix, 409).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Katharine Anthony, *Catherine the Great* (Century Magazine, September, October, November); J. Lewin, *Russische Memoirenliteratur* [reign of Nicholas II.] (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, September); Alfred Poninski, *Les Traditions de la Diplomatie Polonaise* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIX. 4); Edward M. House, *Paderewski: the Paradox of Europe* (Harper's Magazine, December).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

The student of the Latin tradition and institutions in Greco-Turkish lands will derive much profit from the special treatise on feudalism in Naxos, from the time of the dukes of that island to 1818, by the late Perikles G. Zerlentes, *Φεουδαλική Πολιτεία ἐν τῇ Νήσῳ Νάξῳ* (Hermoupolis, Phrères).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Sir Alexander B. W. Kennedy's *Petra: its History and Monuments* (London, *Country Life*) is the result of prolonged investigations on the spot by the author, and presents, besides the history, more than 200 illustrations in photogravure and two aeroplane maps.

Admiral Ballard's articles in the *Mariner's Mirror*, which we have heretofore noticed, are brought together in a volume entitled *Navigators of the Indian Ocean*, published in America by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

The Remonstrantie or report of Francisco Pelsaert, agent of the Dutch East India Company at Agra, 1618 to 1625, has been translated into English by W. H. Moreland and Dr. P. Geyl, professor of Dutch in the University of London, and published under the title *Jahangir's India* (Cambridge, Heffer, pp. xvii, 88).

A Bombay committee, with a subsidy from the Maharajah of Indore, sends out gratuitously in 1925 an edition of Professor N. S. Takakhav's *Life of Shivaji* (Bombay, 1921), adapted from the original Marathi life of the founder of the Maratha empire by K. A. Keluskar (1907) and intended to correct the Mohammedan representations of Professor Jadunath Sarkar's *Shivaji and his Times* and other writers and to present Shivaji as "the director and entrepreneur of the greatest movement for the assertion of national liberty and independence that India has known in pre-British times". The book may be obtained from the Shivaji Literary Memorial Committee in Bombay.

The Oxford University Press has published *A Nation in the Making: being the Reminiscences of Fifty Years of Public Life*, by Sir Surendranath Banerjea.

The firm of Longmans has published a *History of Burma*, by G. E. Harvey, with a preface by Sir Richard Carnac Temple. The history is limited to the period ending with the acquisition of Burma by the English, 1824.

The late Professor Thomas F. Carter, of Columbia University, lived long enough to see in page-proof his learned and remarkably interesting book on *The Invention of Printing in China and its Spread Westward* (Columbia University Press). Messrs. Ginn and Company are the publishers of a tabular view, by Professor Carter, of *Periods of Chinese History and Parallelism with that of the West*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. J. Matignon, *La Grande Figure de la Vieille Chine, Li-Houng-Tchang*, III., concl. (*Nouvelle Revue*, July 15–September 1).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The *Histoire des Berbères et des Dynasties Musulmanes de l'Afrique Septentrionale*, by Ibn Khaldūn, translated from the Arabic by the Baron de Slane (Algiers, 1852-1856), is the most complete repertory of facts concerning North Africa. It has long been very rare, but is now being offered to public subscription in an edition of five volumes, of about 250 pages each; the first volume has just appeared (Paris, Geuthner, 1925).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Colonel Godchot, *Au Maroc; Autour de Mogador, 1912-1913*, I.-VI. (Nouvelle Revue, August 1-October 15); Commandant Henri Carré, *Comment fut Sauvé le Maroc au Mois d'Août 1914* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington expects that vol. I. of the *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, extending to the end of April, 1814, will be published about the first of February. The *Guide to British West Indian Archive Materials, in London and in the Islands, for the History of the United States*, prepared by Professor Herbert C. Bell, Mr. David W. Parker, and others, is waiting only for the completion of the index. The manuscript of the second volume of Dr. Stock's *Proceedings and Debates of Parliament respecting North America* is finished.

The Library of Congress has lately acquired an important collection of letters, proclamations, decrees, etc. (broadside and manuscripts) of the various rulers of Haiti from Toussaint l'Ouverture down; two diaries of Moses Waddell, 1829-1831, and 1833-1836; a photostat copy of reports of the United States Treasury Board, 1785-1787, from originals in the New York Public Library; and, from the Public Record Office, copies of commissions and instructions to various Carolina governors, 1663-1733.

In the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for October, 1924, Mr. Alexander McAdie presents a paper on the Date of Franklin's Kite Experiment (1753), Mr. George S. Eddy one on Dr. Benjamin Franklin's Library, and Mr. W. S. Mason one on the relations of Franklin and Galloway, based on unpublished letters. The installment for South Carolina of Mr. Brigham's catalogue of newspapers is also presented.

Articles in the June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* are: Catholicity in Allegany and Garrett Counties, Maryland, by Rev. O. B. Corrigan; Work of the Sisters of Mercy in the Dioceses of the South, by Sister Mary Eulalia Herron; and Loretto, Bishop Flaget, and Sister Eulalie Flaget, by Sister Mary Antonella Hardy.

The *Bulletin* of the Friends' Historical Association, Autumn number, contains the concluding installment of Ezra K. Maxfield's Friendly Testimony regarding Stage Plays, and a paper by W. W. Dewees on the Free Produce Association of Friends of Philadelphia.

Professor Homer C. Hockett of Ohio State University and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard University, who brought out ten years ago a *Syllabus of United States History* based on Bassett's *Short History of the United States*, have now prepared and privately printed (316 W. Eighth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio) *A New Syllabus of American History, 1492-1925*, based on the authors' *Political and Social History of the United States*. Following each main division are references to other texts, general accounts, and topical readings, the books cited being "carefully restricted in order to come within the resources of college libraries".

Three lectures of Newton D. Baker, secretary of war under President Wilson, delivered before the law school of the University of Virginia on the William H. White Foundation, have been published by Scribner under the title *Progress and the Constitution*.

The (English) Historical Association has published and distributed to its members, as Leaflet no. 63, a pamphlet of 23 pages on *Aspects of the Foreign Policy of the United States*, by Dr. Henry Barrett Learned.

The Johns Hopkins Press will soon issue *Latin America and the War*, by Professor Percy A. Martin of Stanford University, being the last series of the Albert Shaw Lectures on diplomatic history. The next series is to be given this winter by Professor Samuel F. Bemis, of the George Washington University, the subject being "The Mississippi Question and the Spanish Treaty of 1795".

Old Americans: a Scientific Study of the Fathers of America and their Children, by Aleš Hrdlička, is a study of the so-called "American type", an attempt to answer such questions as whether the blend of "Nordics", "Alpines", and, in lesser degree, "Mediterraneans", has resulted in a new subtype of the white race, whether there have been actual modifications of the physical type, and, if so, whether these modifications are in the direction of improvement or of degeneration, together with some speculations upon the future (Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins Company).

The ninth publication of the Marine Research Society of Salem is *Ships and Shipping* (pp. 270, with 118 illustrations), being a collection of pictures, including many American vessels, painted by Antoine Roux of Marseilles and his sons, famous in their time (early nineteenth century) as water-color painters of ships; it includes text and translation of a French monograph on them (Marseilles, 1883). The tenth publication is *Whale Ships and Whaling* (pp. 452, with 207 illustrations), a pictorial history of whaling during three centuries, by George Francis Dow. Remarkable collections have been drawn upon for the illustrations.

Studies in Methodist History, by James M. Culbreth, has been published in Nashville by the Cokesbury Press.

Anti-Semitism in the United States, its History and Causes, by Rabbi Lee J. Levinger, comes from the Bloch Publishing Company, New York.

A Short History of American Railways, by Slason Thompson, is published by Appleton.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, of Wilkes-Barré, Penn., has carried on throughout eastern Pennsylvania a survey which has located 1900 Indian sites. Recent excavations in a mound near Bainbridge, O., conducted by the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Museum, have uncovered what seems to have been a royal burial place, presenting copper weapons and ornaments of exceptional quality. At Mandan, N. Dak., a public Indian museum will shortly be established under the sponsorship of local Masonic bodies, to contain especially objects obtained through recent excavations on the sites of Mandan villages.

In a series of reprints, Messrs. Albert and Charles Boni propose to issue Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi*, in two volumes.

Houghton Mifflin Company has published the *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist* (Rev. Jonathan Boucher).

Besides Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick's edition of the *Diaries of George Washington*, mentioned already, and to be reviewed hereafter, he has prepared and will bring out through the same publisher, the Houghton Mifflin Company, a facsimile edition, with annotations, of George Washington's *Accounts of Expenses while Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army*.

A Reprint of the Journal of George Washington and that of his Guide, Christopher Gist, reciting their Experiences on the Historic Mission from Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, to the French Commandant at Fort Le Boeuf in November-December, 1753, including excerpts from the writings of historians and statesmen as to the importance of the mission, its results and effects on the world's history, edited and compiled by Don M. Larrabee, was privately printed for distribution among the alumni and friends of Allegheny College on the occasion (June, 1924) of the unveiling of the memorial commemorating the respective visits of Washington and Lafayette to the campus of the college.

A volume entitled *George Washington in Love and Otherwise*, by Eugene E. Prussing, has been published in Chicago by Pascal Covici. Among the "otherwise" phases of Washington's life and character treated in the volume are that of the engineer, which the author insists was Washington's true vocation, and that of the captain of industry.

How largely was Jefferson indebted to Montesquieu? Writers have not failed to quote expressions on his part of strong dissent from Montesquieu's doctrines. But, says Professor Gilbert Chinard, these are subsequent to 1790. Without undertaking to settle the question of influence, he shows without difficulty, from extracts in Jefferson's youthful manuscript commonplace-book, that in days before 1776 he familiarized himself with the *Esprit des Lois*, and noted with apparent approval many characteristic passages. These Mr. Chinard prints, with an introduction, *Pensées Choies de Montesquieu, tirées du "Common-place Book" de Thomas Jefferson* (Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1925, pp. 87), in a series of small monographs founded by the society of French professors in America.

Mr. Claude G. Bowers, author of *Party Battles of the Jackson Period*, has produced a volume entitled *Jefferson and Hamilton: the Struggle for Democracy in America* (Houghton Mifflin).

Rufus King and his Times, by Edward H. Brush, is published in New York by Nicholas L. Brown.

It is somewhat remarkable that in the year 1925 a group of Lafayette letters should be brought to light in a farm-house in Oklahoma. It happens however that the owner of the letters, Mr. J. D. Reinhardt, of Crowder, Oklahoma, is a nephew of that Captain Francis Allyn in whose vessel Lafayette came to America in 1824, and these letters, several of them from Lafayette himself, others from his son, G. W. Lafayette, and one each from the latter's wife and daughter, are principally to Captain Allyn. Some of the letters were written during the Southern tour of the Lafayettes, others during the two or three years following their return to France. The letters have been gathered into a small volume, with a suitable introduction, by Professor Edward E. Dale, with the title, *Lafayette Letters* (Oklahoma City, Harlow Publishing Company).

Origins of the Whig Party, by E. Malcolm Carroll, is among the *Duke University Publications* and bears the imprint of the Duke University Press.

The Barnburners, a study of New York politics of the period 1830-1852, by Herbert D. A. Donovan, is brought out by the New York University Press.

The major portion of the edition of the *Life of John Caldwell Calhoun* by William M. Meigs was destroyed by fire immediately after publication, and the book has long been out of print. It is now brought out in a new edition, in two octavo volumes, by G. E. Stechert and Company of New York.

The Houghton Mifflin Company has published for the Massachusetts Historical Society the volume of the *Correspondence of William Hickling Prescott, 1833-1847*, which we have announced in a previous number.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Company expect to issue in the spring a book on *Constitutional Problems under Lincoln*, the fruit of prolonged study, by Professor James G. Randall of the University of Illinois.

The Yale University Press has published *The Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield*, in two volumes, by Theodore C. Smith, professor of history in Williams College.

Professor Charles F. Smith, of the University of Wisconsin, has prepared an account of the life of *Charles Kendall Adams* (Madison, University of Wisconsin, pp. 150). While his administrative service as president of the University of Wisconsin, and earlier as president of Cornell, is chiefly dwelt upon, the historical student will find much to interest him in this intimate record of a life the earlier part of which was spent in historical teaching, and of a man who always retained his interest in that study, and gave to it distinguished service. Dr. Adams was president of the American Historical Association in 1890.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Company has published a biographical volume, *William Graham Sumner*, by Harris E. Starr.

Harris Dickson has produced what is termed a "story-biography" of Hon. John Sharp Williams of Mississippi, to which is given the title *An Old-Fashioned Senator* (Stokes).

The Life of William Jennings Bryan, by Genevieve F. and John O. Herrick, has appeared in Chicago with the imprint of the John R. Stanton Company. Meanwhile *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*, by himself and his wife, Mary B. Bryan, has come from the press of the John C. Winston Company of Philadelphia.

The Bobbs-Merrill Company has published the *Recollections of Thomas R. Marshall*, late vice-president of the United States.

Doubleday, Page, and Company have brought out volume III. of *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*. This volume is in fact a supplement to the two volumes previously published, embodying letters that were not previously accessible.

Maj.-Gen. Robert L. Bullard has brought out through Doubleday, Page, and Company, a volume to which is given the title *Personalities and Reminiscences of the War*.

The firm of Appleton has published a *Life of Elbert H. Gary: the Story of Steel*, from the pen of Miss Ida M. Tarbell.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

On occasion of the opening of the American Wing in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, a lecture on early domestic life in New England was engaged, from the competent and authoritative pen of

Mr. George Francis Dow; he now publishes this entertaining discourse, *Domestic Life in New England in the Seventeenth Century* (Topsfield, Mass., the author, pp. 48), adding to it a detailed account of supplies furnished by the Massachusetts Company in 1629 ff. to Rev. Samuel Skelton of Salem and an invoice of goods shipped from England to a Boston merchant about 1690.

In the October number of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* Mr. G. Andrews Moriarty, jr., illustrates the processes by which medieval and other English genealogies are properly worked out, by an article on the Royal Descent of a New England Settler, and another on the English ancestry of the Derby family of Salem.

The New Hampshire Historical Society has published a *Check List of New Hampshire Local History*, prepared by Mr. Otis G. Hammond.

The Yale University Press has brought out a volume by Professor Arthur B. Darling, with the title *Political Changes in Massachusetts, 1824-1848: a Study of Liberal Movements in Politics*.

Elijah Cobb, 1768-1848: a Cape Cod Skipper, which the Yale University Press has published, is a collection of letters and narratives of voyages by this Cape Cod skipper, for which Ralph D. Paine has furnished an introduction.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections* of October contain for the most part continued articles, George G. Putnam's Salem Vessels and their Voyages, Francis B. C. Bradlee's Blockade during the Civil War (including in this installment some account of the railroads and the Confederacy), and the Old Norfolk County Records. A third volume of *Salem Vessels and their Voyages* (pp. 160, with 40 full-page illustrations of vessels, owners, and masters) is put forth by the Institute.

The October number of the Rhode Island Historical Society's *Collections* contains an article by Howard M. Chapin on Early Rhode Island Flags, and the conclusion of the Memoranda of William Green, by Henry S. Fraser.

In December, 1780, the Providence *Gazette* advertised for subscriptions for a French journal which was to be published at Newport. Discovering this advertisement in 1914, Mr. Howard M. Chapin, librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, referred to it in a pamphlet on *The Printing Press of the French Fleet*. No copy of this *Gazette Française* has ever been known until, this autumn, a file of its issues has been discovered, and has been obtained by the library of the Rhode Island Historical Society.

The John Carter Brown Library, which has carried down from 1780 through 1783 its photostat reproductions of the Newport *Mercury*, has also undertaken, in conjunction with the New York Public Library and the Maryland Historical Society, to reproduce the fifty-five known copies

of the first *Maryland Gazette*, one of the rarest of American newspapers, published by William Parks at Annapolis from 1727 to 1734.

Among the new publications of the Yale University Press is an illustrated book by Rev. Dr. George S. Dickerman, *The Old Mount Carmel Parish, Origins and Outgrowths* (pp. 220), embracing a narrative of Dutch enterprise in pioneer Connecticut territory and that of later Connecticut settlers as pioneers in Pennsylvania and New York.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The July number of the *Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* contains a valuable article on the United Empire Loyalists by Alexander C. Flick, state historian, and an account, by R. Bruce Taylor of Queen's University, of an orderly book of Old Fort Niagara taken when the British captured the fort, October 18, 1813, and preserved in the family of the captor. The new home of the Association at Ticonderoga, provided by the generosity of Mr. Horace A. Moses, is described in connection with the laying of the corner-stone, last July 8.

Volume IV. of *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, prepared by Alexander C. Flick, director of the division of archives and history of the University of the State of New York, has come from the press (Albany, the University).

Father Reginald V. Hughes, O. P., is making preparation for a biography of Father Luke Concanen, O. P., first bishop of New York.

The New York Historical Society has established a scholarship at Columbia University to encourage interest in New York history among undergraduates.

The September *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains a list of the manuscripts and books of Henry George, recently presented to the library by his daughter, Mrs. Anna George de Mille. The October number includes part I. of a paper, by Julius Mattfeld, entitled a Hundred Years of Grand Opera in New York, 1825-1925 (with a selected bibliography). This is continued in the November number.

Valentine's Manual of Old New York, 1926, edited by Henry C. Brown, bears the special title *The Last Fifty Years in New York* (New York, Valentine's Manual, Inc.); this is continued in the November issue.

Messrs. William T. Davis, Charles W. Leng, and R. W. Vosburgh have united in preparing *The Church of St. Andrew, Richmond, Staten Island: its History, Vital Records, and Gravestone Inscriptions* (pp. 266), published under the auspices of the Staten Island Historical Society by Mr. Davis. The pages of history (pp. 15-48) recount with care and with interest the story of an Episcopal church whose life began in 1705.

The Herkimer County Historical Society has recently received an endowment bequest of \$25,000 from the late Dr. A. Walter Suiter of

Herkimer, whose office building, located near the site of old Fort Dayton, was given to the society as a home and a museum.

Among the contents of the October issue of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society are an account of New Jersey Medical History in the Colonial Period, by Richard L. McClenahan; a sketch of John Hart, the New Jersey Signer, by Louis H. Patterson; a continuation of the late Dr. John C. Honeyman's papers on Zion, St. Paul, and other Early Lutheran Churches in Central New Jersey; and the Lost Pages of Lieut. Ebenezer Elmer's Revolutionary Journal. Excepting these pages, which were long missing, the Journal was printed in the society's *Proceedings*, first series, vols. II. and III.

The History of St. Peter's Church in Perth Amboy, New Jersey, from 1698 to 1923, together with a genealogy of the families buried in the churchyard, by Rev. W. Northey Jones, has been published in Perth Amboy by the author.

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* prints in the October number a Memoir of Thomas Gilpin (1727-1777), found among the papers of Thomas Gilpin, jr. (1776-1853). It seems odd that it should have been thought necessary to represent the long "s" of the memoir with an "f" of modern type. This number of the *Magazine* contains also a group of letters relating to the Taking of the Bahamas by the Continental Navy in 1776, contributed by Malcolm Lloyd, jr.

Marian Inglewood is the author of a volume entitled *Then and Now in Harrisburg*, which is published in Harrisburg by the Evangelical Press.

Recent *Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society are: Benjamin West and his Visit to Lancaster, by Charles I. Landis (May 1); Iron Masters of Caernarvon, by T. Roberts Appel (June 5); and the Emigration of Hans Herr, by C. H. Martin (September 4).

Articles in the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: Visit of Lafayette to the Old Glass Works of Bakewell, Pears, and Company, by Thomas C. Pears, jr.; Slavery in Western Pennsylvania, by Edward M. Burns; David Bruce, Federalist Poet of Western Pennsylvania, by Harry R. Warfel; and a continuation of James McKirdy's study of the Origin of the Names given to the Counties in Pennsylvania.

Memoirs of the Bench and Bar of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, by Albert H. Bell, is published in Batavia, New York, by the *Batavia Times* Publishing Company.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains, besides continuations hitherto noted, the Reminiscences of Thomas Ridout (1754-1829), sometime surveyor general of Upper Canada and

member of its legislative council; a number of hitherto unpublished letters, including one from Samuel Chase to Governor John Eager Howard (1790), one from Rembrandt Peale to Governor Kent relative to his portrait of Washington (1826), and three from Roger B. Taney (1831).

Vol. 27 of the *Records of the Columbia Historical Society* (pp. 355) is occupied to half its extent (pp. 174) with a paper by Allen C. Clark, on Abraham Lincoln and the National Capital, scrappy and excessively detailed, but in which there is some material not easily found elsewhere; an account by Washington Topham of the First Railroad running into Washington (the Baltimore and Ohio) and its three depots; and some reminiscences by "Private" J. M. Dalzell.

The papers of the old Board of Public Works of Virginia which were turned over to the Virginia State Library by the Corporation Commission in the summer of 1924 are now being gone over carefully by a special assistant in the archives department and made readily available. These papers include a great deal of material of importance to the highway departments of Virginia and West Virginia. The Library is publishing, as a bulletin, notes on Southside Virginia collected by the Hon. Walter A. Watson, who represented the fourth Virginia Congressional district from 1913 to 1919.

By a gift from Mr. A. W. Weddell, consul general of the United States in Mexico City, and of Mrs. Weddell, the Virginia Historical Society is to be presented with a new fire-proof home in a suburban portion of Richmond, which will reproduce the house at Sulgrave Manor in England. Building will commence early in 1926. When it is finished the society will remove to it its portraits, historic relics, manuscripts, and part of its library, maintaining offices however, and part of the library, at the present building on East Franklin Street, the former home of General Lee.

In the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* Mr. Fairfax Harrison continues his studies of the Culpepers, Proprietors of the Northern Neck, Maj.-Gen. William H. Carter presents a study of General Robert E. Lee, and Miss Juliet Fauntleroy contributes some materials respecting John Hook as a Loyalist.

The contents of the October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* include a paper by Professor Percy S. Flippin of Mercer University on Governor William Gooch of Virginia; Early Settlers in the Valley of Virginia, by Charles E. Kemper; a Vindication of John B. Floyd, by Robert M. Hughes; and some letters of Jefferson, Marshall, Monroe, Henry Lee, and John Breckenridge, from the papers of Archibald Stuart.

Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine has in the October number a brief paper with the title Jefferson after Camden, ac-

accompanied by some letters of Jefferson (1780). Under the title *Emigrants to Ohio and Illinois* some correspondence of Thomas and John H. Moorman (1816, 1844), and some letters of James L. Welsh (1854-1865), are printed. The Norton Correspondence, which is continued, includes a long letter, pertaining chiefly to commercial matters, from George F. Norton, Barbados (1779), to James Withers in London. There is also a political letter of 1841 from Thomas W. Gilmer to George Stillman.

The principal contents of the October number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* are: the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railroad, by Roland B. Eutsler; Fort Loudoun in the Cherokee War, 1758-1761, by P. M. Hamer; the conclusion of the *Prison Experiences of Randolph Shotwell*, by J. G. deR. Hamilton; reprints, with an introduction by William K. Boyd, of two North Carolina tracts of the eighteenth century, namely: Henry McCulloh's *Miscellaneous Representations relative to our Concerns in America* (1761), and Maurice Moore's *Justice and Policy of Taxing the American Colonies in England* (1765); and a group of documents pertaining to the case of Thomas McKnight, Loyalist, with an introduction by D. L. Corbitt.

Historical Papers, series XV. (1925), published by the Trinity College Historical Society (Duke University, Durham, North Carolina), includes two contributions: the one, *Some Chapters in the Life of Willie Person Mangum*, by Penelope McDuffie; the other, the *Lowrie Gang*, an Episode in the History of Robeson County, by James J. Farris. Miss McDuffie, late professor of history in Converse College, South Carolina, who had for some years been engaged upon a biography of Willie P. Mangum, died in October, 1924, leaving only the five chapters here printed in a state of practical completeness. They trace the career of Mangum to the time of his resignation from the Senate in 1836. The history of the Lowrie Gang involves to some extent the story of Raleigh's lost colony and the history of the Croatans.

The April number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* has for its chief and most interesting contents a long letter of January 19, 1766, from Charles Garth, M.P., colonial agent for South Carolina, describing the debates in Parliament respecting America; the journal of Robert Pringle, 1746-1747, and other serial contents are continued. The number for July has an article on Colonel Alexander Parris and Parris Island, by Miss Mabel L. Webber.

The March number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* contains an article by E. Merton Coulter entitled *a Georgia Educational Movement during the Eighteen Hundred Fifties*; one by Dr. F. P. Calhoun on the *Founding and Early History of the Atlanta Medical College*; one by Roswell P. Stephens on *Science in Georgia, 1800-1830*; and the *Personal Recollections of William S. Basinger (1827-1910)*, edited by Lester

Hargrett. The June number includes a paper by Herbert E. Bolton on Spanish Resistance to the Carolina Traders in Western Georgia; one by Warren Grice on the Confederate States Court for Georgia; one by J. G. Johnson entitled the Spaniards in Northern Georgia during the Sixteenth Century; and the Plans for the Colonization and Defense of Apalache, 1675, translated and edited by Katherine Reding. The principal content of the September number is the fourth of Professor P. S. Flippin's papers on the Royal Government in Georgia.

In the October number of the Florida Historical Society *Quarterly* are some Notes on Secession in Tallahassee and Leon County; an article by Isabella M. Williams entitled the Truth regarding "Tiger-Tail"; part II. of William E. Dunn's paper on the Occupation of Pensacola Bay, 1689-1698; and a letter of G. I. F. Clarke, dated at Fernandina, March 19, 1812, giving an account of the surrender of Amelia Island.

In the July *Bulletin* of the Alabama State Department of Archives and History, now in its second volume, is found an account of Montgomery and its Vicinity by Peter A. Brannon. In that of September is a journal or "Memorandum" of Thomas Stocks of a tour from about Madison, Georgia, to Pensacola and return, April 12 to May 27, 1819. In the October number are accounts of the supreme court of Alabama, of the library of the supreme court, and of the Alabama Bar Seventy Years Ago. In the November number is an article by Peter A. Brannon on the Federal Road: Alabama's First Improved Highway.

WESTERN STATES

The September number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains the following articles: Spanish Intrigue in the Old Southwest, 1788-1789, by Arthur P. Whitaker; the Significance of the Latest Third Party Movement, by Fred E. Haynes; the Pacific Railway Issue in Politics prior to the Civil War, by Robert E. Russel; the Mississippi Valley and the Federal Judiciary, by Curtis Nettels; and the Journal of the Santa Fe Trail, edited by William E. Connelley. There is also an account, by Bruce E. Mahan, of the eighteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Detroit and Ann Arbor, April 30-May 2, 1925. The December number has an article by Isaac J. Cox on the Border Missions of General George Mathews; one by L. R. Hafen on the Early Fur Trade Posts on the South Platte; one by Ralph P. Bieber on the Southwestern Trails to California in 1849; and one by R. S. Cotterill on the South Carolina Land Cession. The documents in the number are Journals and Reports of the Black Hawk War, edited by M. M. Quaife, and Letters of James Robertson and Daniel Smith, edited by A. P. Whitaker.

The seventh annual Indiana History Conference was held at Indianapolis December 11-12. This conference is maintained by the state His-

torical Bureau, the Indiana Historical Society, and the Society of Indiana Pioneers, and enlists all the historical interests of the state. The speaker from abroad this year was Professor Dixon R. Fox of Columbia University. The Indiana State Library has secured the original plat-book of Clark's Grant, the land allotted by the Continental Congress to the expedition of George Rogers Clark, 1778-1779, and now embraced in Clark County and the adjacent counties.

The Indiana Historical Bureau published in November *The Swiss Settlement of Switzerland County, Indiana*, a book giving an account of the Swiss vine-growing colony, led from canton Vaud early in the nineteenth century by Jean-Jacques Dufour, that founded Vevay, Indiana. The text of the volume is by Perret Dufour (1807-1884), nephew of Jean-Jacques; it is supplemented by interesting documents and accounts from the papers of the Dufour family, and full notes.

The Bobbs-Merrill Company has brought out *Indiana, its History, Constitution, and Present Government*, by George S. Cottman.

The *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* for April, 1925, is a Jacksonville Centennial number, the articles being for the most part concerned with aspects of the history of Jacksonville and the county, Morgan, of which Jacksonville is the seat.

The October number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* contains an article by Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., on the Trappists of Monk's Mound; the first installment of a paper by Rev. A. Zurbonsen entitled Fifty Years in American Hospital Service (the present article is an account of the coming of the "pioneer" hospital sisters of St. Francis to Springfield, Illinois); a study, by W. W. Baldwin, of the Great Western Railway Systems and how they were Established and Developed; and a continuation of Joseph J. Thompson's article, Illinois's First Citizen: Pierre Gibault.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society has in the September number some Woodford County Notes, by William E. Railey; a variety of documents pertaining to the early history of the state, inserted under the heading "Gleanings from the State Archives"; an account of the Boone Day Celebration, June 13 last; and a continuation of the index to Shelby County marriages.

In the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* for October, 1924 (issued in November, 1925), is the story of Weena and Conestoga, a Cherokee legend, related by George Q. Johnston as told to him by his grandfather, a subchief of the Cherokees. There is also an article by Judge Samuel C. Williams on Tennessee's First Military Expedition (1803). Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis's contribution to the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings*, December, 1906, A Tempest in a Teapot: Jackson's "LL.D.", is reprinted.

Apart from historical sketches of the Michigan Federation of Musical Clubs and of the Western State Normal School at Kalamazoo, the main matter in the *Michigan History Magazine* for October is a biography of Judge Augustus B. Woodward, whose notable career has been carefully worked out by William L. Jenks.

The *Burton Historical Leaflet* of September contains a biography, by M. M. Quaife, of John Harvey, a man identified in several ways with the history of Detroit in the early nineteenth century. In the November *Leaflet* is an article by the same writer, entitled When Detroit invaded Kentucky; also some documents concerning the expedition of Capt. Henry Bird (1780).

In the September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* are a biographical account of William Penn Lyon, by Clara Lyon Hayes; an article on the Origin of Wisconsin's Free School System, by Joseph Schafer; one on the Old Military Road, by H. E. Cole; and a Winter's Journey from Milwaukee to Green Bay, 1843, the record of Increase A. Lapham. In the *Magazine* for December Robert Wild presents some Chapters in the History of the [German-American] Turners; Dr. Schafer gives the Epic of a Plain Yankee Family from the papers of the Howards of Lake, Milwaukee county, and Miss Hayes continues her account of Judge William P. Lyon. The editor also presents the Journal of Salmon Stebbins, Methodist circuit rider of 1837-1838, in which travels of some 6000 miles are recorded.

The Wisconsin State Historical Society has published *The French Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*, by Louise Phelps Kellogg.

The Minnesota Historical Society has recently acquired a set of abstracts of the licenses to trade with Indians in the interior issued in Quebec from 1767 to 1776. These abstracts were compiled at Ottawa from the originals in the Canadian Archives, under the direction of Dr. Wayne E. Stevens, at the expense of a group of middle-western historical agencies, each of which has received a set of the abstracts. The detailed information contained therein includes the names of the traders and the canoemen and lists of various articles of merchandise with records of their value. An interesting series of Norwegian travel letters of 1847 and 1848, originally published in *Den Norske Rigstidende* (Christiania, Norway) from December 6, 1847, to July 3, 1848, has been copied for the society from the files of that newspaper in the library at Oslo. The letters were written by Munch Raeder, a gifted Norwegian scholar and writer who accompanied the Norwegian-Swedish consul general, Adam Lövenskjöld, on a visit to the Norwegian-American settlements in the Middle West in 1847. The society has also acquired several hundred letters written by John and Nancy Aiton, missionaries to the Sioux.

Minnesota History has in the September number a paper by Professor Clarence W. Rife on Norman W. Kittson, a Fur-Trader at Pembina, and

a translation, by Miss Anne H. Blegen, of an article on the Sioux Indians by F. V. Lamare-Picquot, a French naturalist, originally printed in the *Courrier des États-Unis* (New York) in 1847. There is also an account, by the editor, Dr. Buck, of the State Historical Convention at Winona in June of last year. The December issue has an article on Lincoln and Minnesota, also by Dr. Buck; a New Interpretation of the Voyages of Radisson by Arthur T. Adams; an article by Louis A. Tohill on Robert Dickson, the Fur Trade, and the Minnesota Boundary, relating to the latter part of the British period in Minnesota history; and a summary, by Miss Grace L. Nute, of the contents of the Edmund Franklin Ely Papers, showing the life of an early missionary to the Chippewa Indians.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has recently distributed *The Story of the 168th Infantry*, a work in two volumes prepared by John H. Taber, formerly a lieutenant in the regiment. This is a history of an Iowa regiment in the Forty-second or Rainbow Division, and contains vivid descriptions of the experiences of these men who within a brief period were transported from the towns and farms of Iowa to the battle-line. The volumes are illustrated; the second contains a roster of the members of the regiment, some documents relating to it, and an index.

The principal content of the October number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* is a survey, by Jacob A. Swisher, of the Legislation of the Forty-first General Assembly of Iowa.

In the September *Palimpsest* Bruce E. Mahan gives some account of the Great Council of 1825. In the October number is an article by Orville F. Grahame on the Vigilance Committees. The November number has an article by Ben Hur Wilson on Telegraph Pioneering, and one by John E. Briggs on the Battle of Winchester.

The October number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an installment of the Civil War Diary of Benjamin F. Pearson, first lieutenant of Company G, 36th Iowa Infantry.

Among the articles in the October number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are: the Liberal Republican Movement in Missouri, by Thomas S. Barclay; Early Gunpowder Making in Missouri, by William C. Breckenridge; the Osage War, 1837, by Roy Godsey; and an account of the Warrensburg Speech of Frank P. Blair, by Huston Crittenden.

In the October number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* is an article by Edwin P. Arneson on the Early Art of Terrestrial Measurement and its Practice in Texas. The study by Clara L. Koch of the Federal Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860, is concluded, and the Diary of C. C. Cox, "From Texas to California in 1849", is continued.

The History of St. Clement's Church, El Paso, Texas, compiled by Esther D. MacCallum, is published in El Paso by the author (1815 East Rio Grande Street).

The July-September number of *Nebraska History and Record of Pioneer Days* contains an article by A. B. Thomas on the Massacre of the Villatur Expedition at the Forks of the Platte River, August 12, 1720, and a study, by Mgr. M. A. Shine, of the question of the site of the massacre, favoring that on the Loup. The October number contains a variety of minor articles of local interest.

Vol. XXIV., nos. 1-2 of the *University Studies* published by the University of Nebraska is a pamphlet on the Political Organization of the Plains Indians, with special reference to the Council, by Maurice G. Smith.

The Department of History of the state of South Dakota has published vol. XII. of the *South Dakota Historical Collections* (Pierre, pp. 603).

In July last occurred what has been denominated the Upper Missouri Historical Expedition, a sort of pilgrimage of historically minded people to places of historical interest in the upper Missouri region. The expedition was sponsored by a number of the state historical societies of the Northwest, together with a governor or two, but actually, it is understood, planned and carried out by the Great Northern Railway. The expedition, which included a series of memorial celebrations commemorating the notable explorations and discoveries of pathfinders of the Northwest, has been briefly described by Theodore C. Blegen in the September number of *Minnesota History*; a more extended account, prepared by Solon J. Buck, will, it is understood, appear in an early number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*.

The October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* includes an account of the Olympia Narrow Gauge Railroad, by Winlock Miller, jr.; a History of Fort Townsend, by Ray T. Cowell; three letters (1861) from Victor Smith, collector of customs in the Puget Sound district, to Secretary Chase; and a diary of Waman C. Hembree, a soldier in a company of Oregon volunteers sent into the Yakima country in 1855.

The September issue of the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society includes a biographical sketch of Samuel K. Barlow, a Pioneer Road Builder of Oregon, by Mary B. Wilkins; an account of the Newspapers of Oregon, 1846-1870, by Flora B. Ludington; and some extracts from the Journal of Lieut. George F. Emmons (1841), contributed by Lieut. George T. Emmons, U. S. N.

Little, Brown, and Company have brought out *The Old Franciscan Missions of California*, by George Wharton James.

CANADA

The chief article in the September number of the *Canadian Historical Review* is one by the editor, Professor W. S. Wallace, on the Beginnings

of British Rule in Canada. There is also a note on employment and unemployment in Canada in 1819, and the text of a document in which Louis Riel discusses Thomas Scott's execution and his connection with the Red River trouble of 1870. In the December number Judge F. W. Howay, of New Westminster, B. C., relates with interesting details the story of Indian Attacks upon Maritime Traders of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1805; Professor Chester Martin, of the University of Manitoba, prints and explains a body of correspondence between Joseph Howe and Charles Buller, 1845-1848, relating to the final achievement of responsible government in Nova Scotia; Mr. James White, formerly official geographer to the Canadian government, comments at length and with severity on the late Senator Lodge's account of the settlement in 1903 of the Alaska boundary question.

The Rebellion of 1837, by Walter S. Johnson, K. C., which appears as McGill University *Publications*, series VI., no. 8, is an address delivered by Mr. Johnson before the McGill Historical Club, January 22, 1925.

The general board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has published at Toronto a history, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925* (pp. xi, 276), in which Professor John T. McNeill furnishes an excellent continuation of the Rev. William Gregg's earlier *History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (1885).

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 14 of the *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano*, entitled *El Dr. Vicente G. Quesada y sus Trabajos Diplomáticos sobre Mexico* (pp. 203), reprints portions of the elder Dr. Quesada's *Memorias Diplomáticas* respecting service in Mexico in 1891, the Falkland Islands, his arbitration of the Oberlander and Messenger cases between Mexico and the United States, and his mission to the Holy See concerning governmental rights of ecclesiastical patronage in Latin America. No. 15, *Lord Aberdeen, Texas, y California* (pp. xxii, 74), prints, from the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Relations, correspondence that passed in 1844-1846 between its successive secretaries, L. G. Cuevas, Manuel de la Peña y Peña, and Castillo Lanzas, and the Mexican minister in London, Don Thomas Murphy, on the subject of the republic of Texas, with an introduction by Señor Antonio de la Peña y Reyes.

The latest volume of the Hakluyt Society is a body of texts edited by V. T. Harlow under the title *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1667*.

The *Anales de la Academia* [Cubana] *de la Historia* for 1924 contains a report by Dr. Antonio L. Valverde on the remains of Columbus and their former resting-place in the cathedral of Havana, and the con-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—27.

clusion, 1836-1838, of the third volume of the correspondence of Domingo del Monte. A more recent publication presents *La Vida de la Academia de la Historia, 1924-1925*, related by its secretary, Dr. Juan Miguel Dihigo, together with an account, by Dr. Francisco González del Valle, of José de la Luz y Caballero in the Conspiracy of 1844, with an appendix of documents.

An American student in Paris, P. Arthur Watts, has published a considerable volume in West Indian history, *Une Histoire des Colonies Anglaises aux Antilles de 1649 à 1660* (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925, pp. xvi, 518), and a smaller volume of documents, mostly from the Bancroft Library in California, *Nevis and Saint Christopher, 1782-1784* (*ibid.*, pp. xxviii, 160), concerning a period during most of which those islands, half sympathizing with the revolted colonies of the mainland, were for a time under French rule.

Anyone who intends to work seriously in Argentine history should acquire Señor José Revello de Torre's pamphlet, *Los Archivos de la República Argentina* (Seville, Centro de Estudios Americanistas, 1925, pp. 32), a provisional, "first-aid" inventory, but useful.

Vol. XVIII. of the *Documentos para la Historia Argentina* will be a body of materials for the history of education in Argentina during the colonial period, with an introduction by Juan Probst.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. R. Hay, *The Romance of American Expansion* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Albert Isnard, *La Carte Prétendue de Christophe Colomb*, II. (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); E. A. Benians, *Adam Smith's Project of an Empire* (Cambridge Historical Journal, I. 3); Charles Moore, *The Stepfatherhood of George Washington*, V. (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, November); A. Q. Fairchild, *With von Bernstorff's Ancestors in America* (Queen's Quarterly, July, August, September); G. D. Harmon, *The Proposed Amendments to the Articles of Confederation*, concl. (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Harrington Putnam, *How the Federal Courts were given Admiralty Jurisdiction* (Cornell Law Quarterly, June); T. Baty, *The Story-Stowell Correspondence* (Juridical Review, September); Everett S. Brown, *The Presidential Election of 1824-1825* (Political Science Quarterly, September); C. Cestre, *Comment Tocqueville a vu et prévu le Mouvement Intellectuel aux États-Unis* (Revue Anglo-Américaine, October); Rear-Adm. Livingston Hunt, *The Attempted Mutiny on the U. S. Brig "Somers"* [November, 1842] (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, November); W. C. Carpenter, *The Red River Boundary Dispute* (American Journal of International Law, July); Simeon Strunsky, *Theodore Roosevelt and*

the Prelude to 1914 (Foreign Affairs, October); Agustin Edwards, *Foreign Policy in Latin-America historically considered* (Cambridge Historical Journal, I. 3); Carlos Leonhardt, S.J., *El P. Pedro Lozano, S.J., Historiador Rioplatense* (Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, January-March, 1925); Léon Vignols, *L'Ancien Concept Monopole et la Contrebande Universelle* [chiefly in the South Sea] (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, 1925, 3).

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Dr. Charles M. Andrews, president of the American Historical Association, is Farnam professor of American history in Yale University.

Dr. Frank B. Marsh is associate professor of ancient history in the University of Texas.

Dr. W. L. Langer is an associate professor of history in Clark University.

Dr. Roy F. Nichols is an assistant professor of history in the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Conyers Read, of Philadelphia, who contributes the introduction to the documents, was formerly a professor of history in the University of Chicago.